

By Mr. **HERTER**:
H. R. 3615. A bill for the relief of Peng-si Mei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **HOLMES**:
H. R. 3616. A bill for the relief of the Pacific Fruit Express Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **KEATING** (by request):
H. R. 3617. A bill for the relief of Felicja Wlodek-Gatowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **MULTER**:
H. R. 3618. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lillian Trancher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3619. A bill for the relief of John Lemons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **STIGLER**:
H. R. 3620. A bill for the relief of Russel Earnest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

192. By Mr. **LOVRE**: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing the Congress of the United States to assume its full obligation to Sioux Indians in the State of South Dakota, in regard to the payment of old-age assistance; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

193. By The **SPEAKER**: Petition of Hubert H. Moss, president, Chamber of Commerce, Gainesville, Tex., recommending that universal military training be considered by the Congress in a bill separate and distinct from matter contained in any other bill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

194. Also, petition of Miss Corinne M. Calahan, secretary, Woman's Club of Endicott, Endicott, N. Y., protesting vigorously the rising prices of foodstuffs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

195. Also, petition of Reuben L. Robertson, secretary, Grand Lodge, Knights of Pythias, Indianapolis, Ind., stating their opinion that our National Government should, to the best of its ability, assist the free peoples of the United Nations and the Eastern Hemisphere to withstand the onslaught of communism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

196. Also, petition of Generoso F. Tanseco, president, Filipino Shipowners Association, Manila, Philippine Islands, opposing extension of charters of United States maritime vessels to three Philippine operators; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

197. Also, petition of Miss Louise Colella, adjutant, Disabled American Veterans Auxiliary, Chapter No. 76, Pittsburgh, Pa., relative to going on record as in favor of a 17½ percent annual pay increase for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

198. Also, petition of Robert T. Laing, secretary, the Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers' Association, Altoona, Pa., relative to going on record as being opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway and hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Public Works.

199. Also, petition of Mrs. Lena Signoralle, Mothers' Club of Public School 14, Corona, N. Y., endorsing a resolution concerning and controlling narcotics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

200. Also, petition of Mr. Francisco Colon Gordiano, president, Confederation General de Trabajadores de Puerto Rico, San Juan, P. R., relative to agreements adopted by the General Confederation of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-blessed God, grant that during this day we may have a new and worthier appreciation of life and all our blessings, for we penitently confess that we are frequently guilty of the sacrilege of an ungrateful and indifferent spirit.

Inspire our minds and hearts with thoughts of Thy greatness and the inexhaustible riches of Thy grace as we strive to build a finer social order and a nobler civilization.

We pray that when we are discouraged and are tempted to yield to despair we may hear Thy voice awakening within us the glad assurance that Thy divine purposes can never be defeated.

May our beloved country continue to be a strong link in the chain of peace-loving and peace-making nations who are daily praying and laboring for the fulfillment of that blessed day of prediction when the black demon of war shall be forever destroyed.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 349. An act to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense.

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The **SPEAKER**. The unfinished business is the question on the passage of the bill (H. R. 2612) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District of Columbia.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA) there were—ayes 30, noes 13.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 278, nays 116, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]
YEAS—278

Adair
Addonizio
Albert

Allen, Calif.
Angell
Arends

Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres

Bailey
Baker
Baring
Barrett
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Beamer
Beckworth
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bentsen
Betts
Blackney
Blatnik
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bolton
Bosone
Bow
Bramblett
Bray
Breen
Brehm
Brownson
Buckley
Budge
Buffett
Burnside
Burton
Busbey
Bush
Butler
Byrne, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carnahan
Case
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Chilperfield
Chudoff
Church
Clemente
Cole, Kans.
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Crawford
Crosser
Crumpacker
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denny
Denton
Devereux
Dollinger
Dondero
Donohue
Donovan
Doyle
Durham
Eaton
Eberharter
Ellsworth
Elston
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fisher
Flood
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Fugate
Fulton
Furcolo
Gamble
Garmatz

Gavin
Goodwin
Gordon
Gossett
Graham
Granahan
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Hall
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harrison, Wyo.
Hart
Harvey
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hedrick
Heffernan
Heller
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoffman, Ill.
Hollifield
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Howell
Hunter
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Jackson, Wash.
James
Jarman
Javits
Jenison
Johnson
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karsten, Mo.
Kearney
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Kennedy
Kerr
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Lane
Lanham
Lantaff
Latham
Lesinski
Lind
Lucas
Lyle
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McDonough
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
McMullen
McVey
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Mahon
Martin, Mass.

NAYS—116

Aandahl
Abbitt
Abernethy
Allen, Ill.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson,
August H.
Andrews

Mason
Meador
Merrow
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Mitchell
Morano
Morgan
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Mumma
Murdock
Murphy
Nelson
Nicholson
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
Ostertag
Patten
Patterson
Perkins
Philbin
Poage
Poulson
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Prouty
Quinn
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Ramsey
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Regan
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Riehlman
Rivers
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Scott, Hardie
Scott,
Hugh D., Jr.
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Sheehan
Sheppard
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Stigler
Stockman
Taylor
Thompson,
Mich.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Towe
Vail
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vaughn
Welch
Werdel
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Wolverton
Yates
Yorty
Zablocki

Bryson
Burdick
Burleson
Camp
Cannon
Carlyle
Clevenger
Cole, N. Y.
Cooper
Cunningham

Curtis, Nebr.	LeCompte	Schwabe
Davis, Ga.	Lovre	Scrivner
DeGraffenried	McCulloch	Shafer
D'Ewart	McGregor	Short
Dolliver	McMillan	Sikes
Doughton	Magee	Simpson, Ill.
Elliott	Marshall	Smith, Kans.
Fellows	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Wis.
Gary	Miller, Nebr.	Stanley
Gathings	Morris	Steed
George	Murray, Tenn.	Stefan
Golden	Norblad	Sutton
Grant	Norrell	Taber
Gregory	O'Hara	Tackett
Gross	O'Toole	Talle
Harris	Passman	Teague
Harrison, Va.	Patman	Thomas
Herlong	Phillips	Trimble
Hill	Pickett	Velde
Hooven	Polk	Vinson
Hoffman, Mich.	Rankin	Vorys
Hull	Reams	Vursell
Jenkins	Reed, N. Y.	Weichel
Jensen	Rees, Kans.	Wheeler
Jones, Mo.	Richards	Williams, Miss.
Jones,	Riley	Willis
Hamilton C.	Roberts	Winstead
Jones,	Robeson	Withrow
Woodrow W.	Rogers, Tex.	Wood, Idaho
Larcade	Sabath	

NOT VOTING—39

Allen, La.	Fogarty	Potter
Anfuso	Frazier	Redden
Armstrong	Gillette	Roosevelt
Bakewell	Gore	Sasser
Boykin	Hébert	Secrest
Brooks	Kee	Shelley
Buchanan	Keogh	Sieminski
Chenoweth	Mansfield	Tollefson
Cox	Miller, Md.	Walter
Dawson	Morton	Whitaker
Dingell	Murray, Wis.	Wolcott
Dorn	O'Konski	Wood, Ga.
Fine	O'Neill	Woodruff

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Wood of Georgia against.
Mr. Potter for, with Mr. Woodruff against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin against.

• Until further notice:

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Fine with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Chenoweth.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 185.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby designates Tuesday, April 17, 1951, for the celebration of Pan-American Day on which day remarks appropriate to such occasion may occur.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand this is similar to a resolution which is adopted by the House every year?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 153 (B) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3196) to amend section 153 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he will give us an explanation with reference to this bill?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a short explanation of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3196 should be enacted by Congress prior to April 15. The purpose of the bill is simply to make it unnecessary for trusts under which all the net income must be distributed currently to file the special return required by section 153 (b) of the code. Under regulations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue these returns are due on April 15.

This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means, it involves no loss of revenue since it deals only with the requirement of furnishing information returns, and it has the approval of the Treasury Department.

H. R. 3196 amends section 153 (b) of the code, which section was enacted by the Congress in the Revenue Act of 1950 as a part of its tax program to prevent unreasonable accumulations of income of trusts. Section 153 (b) requires in effect that trusts which claim charitable deductions must file an information return containing certain detailed information regarding the operation of the trusts. However, as presently enacted section 153 (b) applies also to trusts in which the income for trust accounting purposes must be distributed currently to the taxable beneficiary. In other words, in these cases the trustee has no discretion to accumulate the income, and in these cases no purpose is served by giving the charitable beneficiary of the trust information which would enable it to put pressure upon the trustee to distribute accumulated income. This bill simply provides that in the cases where the net income must be distributed currently there is no obligation upon the trustee to file the special return required by section 153 (b) of the code. Furnishing the information required under section 153 (b) in these cases would involve an exhaustive analysis of innumerable trusts and the making of complex calculations which would cast a very heavy burden and a considerable expense upon fiduciaries. Since the furnishing of information in these cases would not accomplish any useful purpose, it is important to relieve

fiduciaries of this unnecessary obligation as provided for in this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1949, section 153 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to special returns required from trusts claiming charitable, etc., deductions under section 162 (a) of such code) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"This subsection shall not apply in the case of a taxable year if all the net income for such year, determined under the applicable principles of the law of trusts, is required to be distributed currently to the beneficiaries."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3587, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through page 11 of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that I may have the attention of the Members because I think this is important to each of you. On yesterday this Committee adopted an amendment reducing the funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation for the remainder of this fiscal year. I do not believe that we did too good a job of getting over to you what the full import of this will mean to each of you and to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation has been operating on a deficiency basis since the beginning of the fiscal year. This was approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget under authority to apportion funds on a deficiency basis when necessary to do so to protect life or property. In this case Federal property, represented by commodity stocks of over \$2,000,000,000 was at stake. In view of this situation, any reduction in the amount contained in this bill would require the release of additional employees. This further reduction of \$750,000 for the fiscal year will require the release of another 1,000 to 1,300 employees, approximately 30 percent of the personnel working for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I make no plea here for those employees, because they can go right on to defense jobs; but I would like to direct your attention to the workload and what the effect of this will be. To me this is of real importance.

On April 9 the inventories on hand with the Commodity Credit Corporation were valued at \$1,447,681,000. This includes 418,000,000 bushels of corn, 180,000,000 of wheat, 31,000,000 bushels of other grains, 9,900,000 hundredweight of grain sorghums, 390,000,000 pounds of seed, 513,000,000 pounds of linseed oil, 30,000,000 pounds of dry milk and 158,000,000 pounds of rosin. There are 10,000 warehouses with which the Commodity Credit Corporation now has to work out the details on of paying storage and closing out these accounts for the volume of commodities that have gone through. The effect of your vote yesterday—and goodness knows there is not a man in this House that has done more to reduce personnel than I have, and I mean that—in cutting this out, will delay the settlement of these accounts; and you are going to hear from the farmers throughout this country because you are putting off for 6 or 8 months the settlement of these accounts.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I just want to say to the gentleman that I have taken occasion this morning to look into this situation myself, and I feel the same concern that he does as to the effect of this amendment. What it really amounts to, as I understand, is a 30-percent reduction in operating funds for the remainder of this year, and a corresponding cut in personnel.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman—and there is no abler nor sounder Member of Congress—is certainly correct. I would like to say that there are 300,000 grain accounts that have got to be handled. They have to go through the volume of their business and determine the amount of warehousing charges, the amount of storage, the amount of freight, and the date of delivery. They have to do all of those things in effecting settlements. There is but one way to get at this vast volume of work that is in the Commodity Credit Corporation; you have to do it with people, and you have to pay those people. You either do it the way we are trying to do it or you do it anyway. We are trying to catch up with this backlog of more than 37,000 accounts by letting them have enough folks to do it by July 1. If you make us carry it over until next year, you will have to have an additional number of employees above what we expect to recommend on the payroll for an entire fiscal year.

I can tell you that this committee is just as economy-minded as you are. I think I will take the opportunity to tell you that our subcommittee is of the opinion and expects to take appropriate action to cut the Commodity Credit Corporation by \$4,000,000 in administrative funds for the next fiscal year. But it would be false economy to tie up the farmers of this country at a time when

you are trying to get them to increase production.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. I wish the gentleman would explain to the Members why the committee reduced the estimated amount by \$1,100,000 if it is so essential that they have these employees.

Mr. WHITTEN. Just because we are just like the gentleman from Massachusetts, we want to cut just as far as we feel we can afford to, but we think we have gone that far. We do think, with all due deference to my friend from Massachusetts, that we are in a little better shape to pass judgment after listening to all the details. I think the gentleman will be frank to say that he is not too familiar with the details of this proposition, and not being on this particular committee, he has not had the same opportunity to know, except that in his heart he wants to reduce Federal expenditures. He offered an amendment and if I may express my opinion, to his surprise, it was adopted.

Mr. HESELTON. It is quite possible that it was to my surprise, but I hope I will be further surprised today in that the House will continue to consider the advisability of reducing nonessential Federal expenditures.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will agree with every word the gentleman has said. When he used the word "nonessential" he hit me just exactly where I stand. But I am saying that this amendment is false economy. When you have about \$2,000,000,000 worth of commodities, when you have to handle them, when you have 300,000 grain accounts alone, not to mention cotton, linseed oil, eggs, resin, and seeds, you have a big business that has to be properly operated, and this committee is trying to provide for that without an extra dollar.

I should like to point out, and this is no threat, that you took rather untimely action a few years ago on warehousing with the Commodity Credit Corporation, and it did not work out so happily for my good friends on the left. I mention that because here again, if you do not—and I expect to ask for a roll call at the conclusion of the consideration of this bill—go along with letting us move these commodities out in a proper way, clearing out these records to make proper settlement with the farmers throughout the country, you are not saving money, because we are going to cut these employees off the 1st of July.

May I point out to you, too, that this settlement date is April 30 on many other things in the Department. If they do not have the people with whom to do

the work, that, too, is going to have to be delayed 6, 8, or 9 months.

Many of you come from consumer areas. I know the cost of living is high because it affects me, too. But I am saying that it is not good at a time when we are asking the farmers to produce beyond anything they have ever produced in the past to hamstring and delay a settlement, particularly when you can effectuate it and make it now more cheaply than you can if you let everything go ahead.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that if we reduce the number of employees it will delay the disposition of thousands of tons of materials and goods which are now in warehouses and which it is costing the country, unnecessarily, millions of dollars each year for storage?

Mr. WHITTEN. In my judgment if you make this reduction it will cost you at least 5 to 25 times more money than you will save. That is borne out by the records of this committee. I am placing these facts before you now so that you may vote as I believe you should when we get a separate vote at the conclusion of this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What I gather from what the gentleman is saying is that this organization is so large now that they need all these employees to close out the accounts. That is what you are telling us, is it not?

Mr. WHITTEN. No; I am trying to say to you that this organization is so large and has such a volume of business that it takes quite a number of employees to handle the business. They have already laid off four or five hundred employees. Why make further reductions? This will not add a single person to the organization. This will let them keep about two-thirds of the people that they have, people who are entirely familiar with this job; and the idea is to have that many people so that they can catch up with the job by the first of the next fiscal year. We have to do the work. People have to do the work and you have to pay them. We are trying to keep enough of them so that they can clean up the backlog by the first of July. Therefore they will not have to carry too many people through the next fiscal year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How long is that condition going to continue? Are we ever going to have a chance to cut down on them?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am advising the gentleman that the subcommittee has made certain recommendations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, I know that; they want economy, but when are we going to have a chance to cut down on them?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not know how many times I have to repeat it so that

the gentleman will understand it, but we are cutting out \$4,000,000 in the next year's appropriation, or at least we are recommending that to the Congress. I trust the gentlemen will vote for that reduction.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is that the only cut that can be made?

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman sees fit, he can offer a motion to cut it out entirely. I do not agree with him, but he can offer a motion to eliminate the Commodity Credit Corporation entirely. But if he does, I think he will rue the day that he did.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I am being called away from the Chamber, I ask unanimous consent to take up, out of order, an amendment to the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: On page 18, line 7, strike out "\$38,000,000" and insert "\$33,029,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to reduce the appropriation by approximately \$5,000,000. It is offered in compliance with a voluntary reduction suggested by the Office of Price Stabilization. The committee is now informed that since the date of the hearings recruitment of personnel has lagged to the extent that the amount of \$20,679,000 will be adequate to carry this agency through the balance of the fiscal year. The reduced amount is the full amount requested by the Office of Price Stabilization for the balance of the year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I offered the amendment to which the gentleman from Mississippi has addressed himself, I think I should say something about the amendment, explain what I think it means and why I think you should vote for it. If you look at the committee report, you will see a request was made for \$3,850,000. The committee says this about the justifications:

While the committee recognizes the need for some additional funds for this purpose, it does not feel that it can recommend more than \$2,750,000, in view of the decreased demands which will be made upon the Corporation in the future—

And this is important—

due to the change from surpluses to shortages in many agricultural commodities.

Mr. Chairman, I submit, if you read the committee hearings, you will come to the same conclusion I did, that this Corporation simply did not justify its request, and that the committee very properly, in my judgment, reduced it substantially to the extent of \$1,100,000.

Certainly the question arises why so dire results would come from a saving of

an additional \$750,000 with apparently no protest coming from downtown as to the elimination of \$1,100,000 by the committee. Could it be that the original request was padded by over a million dollars? I offered the amendment to reduce it an additional \$750,000 primarily because I insist that there was no adequate justification, until the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] took the floor this morning and very ably and very fairly placed the case before the House. I do not know whether it is possible to sustain judgment against the amendment on the basis of what the gentleman offered us this morning. I suspect that the Corporation became very much concerned after we acted yesterday. I submit it should be concerned when it is asking this House to appropriate \$2,375,000 without making more of an explanation than appears in the hearings. That may be a small amount in terms of what we are asked to do everyday when appropriation bills are considered, but I think the adoption of the amendment should be a warning to this agency and every other agency in this Government of ours than in these days, when we are piling a load on the taxpayers of this country which they can hardly stand, they must justify fully their requests before any committee.

I have tried to follow the activities of this Corporation for over a year. Last year this House unanimously passed a bill which would have helped us to liquidate this whole program, as far as edible food commodities are concerned, and some of the losses which this Corporation has placed on the taxpayers of this country which are still continuing at a staggering rate. I have taken into consideration in the main such commodities as dried milk and eggs, cheese and butter, up through January of this year. In handling these four commodities they have incurred a loss of \$104,327,731.98. When I mention this loss I am not speaking of the other results, although I am fully cognizant that this particular Corporation could not have done these things without contributing materially to the high cost of living that everybody is paying, farmers, consumers, and everybody else. I say it is time for us to give a note of sharp warning to this agency that they have to revise their activities.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] says that this is a liquidation program. I hope that will be the case. I ask the gentleman from Mississippi if this particular Corporation is not back in the field now buying hundreds of thousands of pounds of butter, and whether that does not have an effect on the whole situation.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. HESELTON. I yield gladly. I want to make it entirely clear that I know the respect and admiration the Members of this House have for the gentleman and I share that high opinion of him. In offering the amendment, I intended no reflection whatever upon the excellent work he has done. Rather, it was and is my opinion that the Corporation forced the committee to make a difficult deci-

sion because of its failure to present sufficient facts to arrive at a satisfactory figure. I believed yesterday and believe now that we could insure a full disclosure before the committee in the other body by adopting this slightly reduced amount.

Mr. WHITTEN. The basic law states what they shall do and what they shall not do. It is governed by the basic law which has to be changed before their activities can be changed. But I call attention to the fact that I hope I did not say anything that reflected on the gentleman in the least. I know how fair he is and how sincerely desirous he is for economy. He ably represents his district and his viewpoint. Too ably, in my opinion, on yesterday.

Mr. HESELTON. I assure the gentleman I had no such understanding of any remark by him. I said the gentleman made an excellent presentation of his side of the case. That is what he always does and his colleagues respect, admire, and trust him because of that.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate this comment, but I do want to take occasion to say that I do not yield to the gentleman in my desire for economy, but I think it should be pointed out that the Commodity Credit Corporation has gotten back almost 96 cents out of every dollar it has handled.

Mr. HESELTON. I have not addressed myself at any time, in the last year and a half that I have been studying this, to the storage of basic commodities. I know very little about that phase of the program. It may be fully justified. I have been addressing myself to this insane and indefensible program of buying up millions of pounds of butter, dried milk, cheese, and dried eggs, and other food that might be consumed by people who need them but cannot afford to buy them.

I think the gentleman supported the bill that was passed last year but did not clear the other body. What I would like to say in conclusion is this: I think the committee did a very commendable thing in cutting the request down by \$1,100,000. I do not see why the House should not be given an opportunity to go a little bit further in the legislative process, and let that Corporation come up to the other body and justify it, if there is any justification. I doubt if there is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I find the gentleman and I in so much accord that I cannot understand how we got into this difference, because, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, I hounded the Department of Agriculture to take action or recommend

the legislation which he mentioned. I did it repeatedly, year after year. I say now the Republican Congress did not change the law. No Democratic Congress changed the law. The Secretary said, "I have recommended it repeatedly, and the Congress will not do it." I said, "You recommend it every Monday morning and make the newspapers every Wednesday, until the Congress does do something." He followed that suggestion, and we got relief.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has made a great deal of money on the basic commodities, not to mention the value of having these commodities on hand during our time of extreme need in the recent war. The gentleman and I are in thorough accord on the need for economy as we are on this basic commodity program.

Mr. HESELTON. Does the gentleman believe this Corporation justified the amount he recommended?

Mr. WHITTEN. I certainly do.

Mr. HESELTON. Does the gentleman think they would be injured materially if we were to adopt this amendment and let them come up and make a better showing before the other body?

Mr. WHITTEN. When the gentleman says "they" I remind him that it is not the personnel in which I am interested. I think such an amendment would cause the Corporation to lose many times the dollars to be saved by his amendment and cause untold delay in settling these accounts which are with the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. HESELTON. May I say in reply that if this Corporation was doing its best to liquidate this program I would ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment if I could, but I am convinced that they are not doing it. Only this morning my office was able to obtain the report that was filed for February. If they need these employees so much why do they not take care of their business as any ordinary business concern would? Here it is the middle of April and we cannot find out what they did in February; and we will not be able to find out what they are doing this month until June. It is about time we taught some of these agencies that they had better make an effort to carry out the mandate of the gentleman and his committee and of the Congress. I think this is one opportunity for us to bear down on them and I think we should.

As I stated, the report for the month ending February 28, reached my office this morning. I have made a preliminary analysis of the situation disclosed by that report so far as 10 commodities are concerned. With reference to the quantities and values of these commodities, it shows that there has been a decrease of 3,061,441,497 pounds, and of \$231,870,716.75 from June 30, 1950, to February 28, 1951. I am including these figures under the permission granted in the House, first, to have them available in the record of this debate and, second, to make it easier for all of us to follow the course which may be taken by the Commodity Credit Corporation with ref-

erence to the alleged intention of disposing of these commodities during the

next few months. The tabulation is as follows:

	Inventory			
	Dollars		Pounds	
	June 30, 1950	Feb. 28, 1951	June 30, 1950	Feb. 28, 1951
Butter.....	99,452,285.29	13,512,927.08	161,649,213	21,551,045
Cheese.....	19,706,623.64	2,998,799.96	58,902,053	8,613,331
Milk, dried.....	45,718,460.06	18,409,891.81	362,931,819	139,879,604
Eggs, dried.....	103,290,365.96	73,614,416.45	93,918,525	73,842,769
Peanuts, shelled.....	None	1,362,471.38		8,877,824
Rice.....	3,019,321.12	2,654,763.91	68,996,200	28,988,200
Beans, dry edible.....	79,689,881.33	62,980,217.83	968,710,200	764,254,200
Grain sorghum.....	104,699,277.02	49,160,146.91	4,127,422,400	1,773,958,500
Peas, dry edible.....	3,191,320.56	2,256,405.16	91,225,900	55,332,000
Soybeans.....	163,271.79	10,049.53	3,181,020	198,360
Total.....	458,930,806.77	226,960,090.02	5,936,937,330	2,875,495,833

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the thing that gets me about this is that with all the talk about it we do not get a statement of the number of employees presently involved and the number that will be involved in the \$800,000 that the gentleman from Massachusetts proposes to cut from the bill. I am wondering if the gentleman from Mississippi would give us some information of that kind so that we might have the full picture. Eighteen million three hundred thousand dollars is a lot of money and it ought to hire a lot of people.

Mr. WHITTEN. I may say to the gentleman from New York that the Commodity Credit Corporation will have to let between 1,000 and 1,300 people go immediately. There is plenty of defense work to be done; I am not crying for those employees for there is plenty for them to do in the Government right now in defense work; but the thing is that the workload is there and the work has got to be done. If we do not do it now when it should be cleared up it will have to be done later and we will have to carry additional employees through next year where they will be on for an entire fiscal year. I am making no plea for these employees, because there is plenty of work in the Government under these defense agencies for them; but the workload is there and, frankly, they could take this 1,000 or 1,300 people and use them on the work to be done. Not only will it result in losses to the Commodity Credit Corporation many times the amount of money involved here, or at least there will be the chance of that, but it will make them spend more money for personnel during the next fiscal year, because this work has got to be finished. All I can tell you is that this is the result of exhaustive work and exhaustive hearings, and I do not yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts in my efforts to bear down on these departments. I think the printed hearings of the committee show that to be the case.

Mr. TABER. The \$18,300,000 that they would have available if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts stays in the bill would still leave them at least 4,500 employees. It seems to me that that is a great num-

ber of employees for that organization to have to look after what business it has. I should like a little elaboration on that so that the membership might have an idea of just what kind of picture they are facing.

Mr. WHITTEN. I may say to the gentleman from New York that that amount of money which he has mentioned was the amount available from the first of July last for the fiscal year; and, further, as I tried to point out, for some months now they have been operating under a deficiency, which is prohibited except in cases where protection of life or property is involved. In this instance with a corporation that has on its hands \$2,000,000,000 worth of Government property the Bureau of the Budget allowed them to proceed, notwithstanding our prohibition against deficiencies.

So they have been operating under a deficiency. In view of that if you make an unreasonable cut here you are leaving the situation where you risk Government property and you are not going to save money.

Mr. TABER. So that we may have a little better picture of this thing, I have in front of me the green sheets that were submitted. In 1951 there were carried funds for the employment of 2,017 in the Department and 3,721 outside. I was low on the figures I gave in my recent estimate. In other words, they had available to them 5,700 employees with the original \$16,000,000 that was provided. It seems to me that is an awful lot of employees and that such a collection of employees ought to be able to do the business properly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes because I think we ought to have some idea of what this is about under the circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman said that on a certain date there were 3,700.

Mr. TABER. That is just in the field. In the Department there were 2,000 besides that.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to point out to the gentleman that we certainly have been trying to do the same thing.

As of February 28 the number of employees had been reduced to 3,055. We have tried to cut this down in every way we could and we had hoped there would be some premium for the committee trying to hold these things down. The adoption of the amendment yesterday rather indicates otherwise. I still say you will make a costly mistake money-wise so far as this amendment is concerned. I do not differ with the gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the question, but we have gone through the hearings and we are in a little better position to judge what it will cost and what it will save.

Mr. TABER. The problem is that we have figures given in the green sheets that were furnished by the budget. Now, according to those green sheets, the number of employees in the field was 4,200, the number in the Department was 2,017. That is the total number provided for under the original appropriation. If you give them \$2,000,000 more, that makes over 6,500 employees. Just how they are in trouble operating that set-up with 6,000 employees is kind of difficult for an ordinary fellow to understand and figure out. I want to see the Congress be fair with them, but it just does not make sense when they request such a number. That is the way it looks to me.

Mr. WHITTEN. I agree with the gentleman, except I insist that the number is half of what he has stated. It is 3,055 as of February 28.

Mr. TABER. Why then do the green sheets that the budget submitted to us indicate that the funds already provided, without this additional amount, would let them have this 6,500? That is what I cannot understand. There must be something the matter somewhere, either with the budget or with the Commodity Credit Corporation and the information it gives to the committee. I think that agency needs a pretty thorough overhauling.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this debate unduly, but I do not want the impression to go out either that everyone who might speak on this subject on this side of the aisle is in favor of this amendment that was adopted yesterday.

With respect to the number of employees of the Commodity Credit Corporation, I was told over the phone just a few moments ago that it is approximately 3,500, and that this cut, coming at the time it does, would mean that they would have to reduce the number by somewhere between 1,000 and 1,300; in other words, while this cut, if made last July at the beginning of the fiscal year, would have been only a 5-percent cut on the total appropriation, coming now when the fiscal year is almost up it means a 30-percent cut in the amount of funds that will be available for the remainder of the year, and it means a 30-percent cut in the number of employees. This comes at a time which is naturally one of the busiest seasons in the operation of the Commodity Credit

Corporation, because it comes when the Corporation is taking over commodities that have been under the loan program.

I appreciate the great contribution that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESLTON] has made during the past year or two in bringing to light some things that should have been uncovered in the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I think he has done a grand job. I have been happy to work with him on occasion. He is the original sponsor, of course, of the bill that the House passed last year which provided for a more sensible method of distributing perishable commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Ordinarily I would be very much inclined to go along with the gentleman from Massachusetts on a matter of this kind, but I believe that if you will read the RECORD of yesterday and read the statement which he made then in support of his amendment and will compare it with the information which has been made available today, you will have to agree with me that the gentleman from Massachusetts did not make his usual, careful study of the situation before he offered this amendment.

I submit that under the facts that have been made available on the subject this morning, that we will be making a very great mistake and one which will cost the Government of the United States many times the amount of this small saving if we should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. There is nothing so costly as false economy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, while we are really talking about the Commodity Credit Corporation and the distribution of perishable commodities, I think the RECORD should show that the Congress is to blame for any situation that exists. We pass the laws that the Department of Agriculture must carry out, and I think we should assume our own responsibility. We compelled, by law, the Department of Agriculture to make certain purchases, support prices, and we then told them that they could not dispose of them except under very, very limited conditions. Then the inevitable result had to follow, like the willful destruction of potatoes. Naturally the people could not understand that; I could not, but still a majority of this Congress are the ones who did that. I see the gentleman from the potato State [Mr. FELLOWS] is apparently disturbed at something I said. I will yield to him in a moment. But I worked very hard, as did the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESLTON], to try to create some situation where we could have distribution without destruction.

I yield now to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. FELLOWS. The gentleman spoke of the potatoes in Maine.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just picked it out of the air, because it is an interesting subject.

Mr. FELLOWS. These potatoes do not come wholly out of the air. However, this is what I want to call to the gentleman's attention. As they destroy these

potatoes, perhaps some 15,000,000 bushels, under our program of so-called reciprocity Canada ships in 15,000,000 bushels. The result is that we support their price as we have been supporting ours. That is what we call the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. The gentleman calls that cause and effect, does he?

Mr. FELLOWS. I call that this administration's splendid theory.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman justify the payment of the support price for potatoes, and then destroying them?

Mr. FELLOWS. Certainly not.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's State got the benefit of it.

Mr. FELLOWS. I do not know about the State getting the benefit of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. They certainly got a lot of money up there.

Mr. FELLOWS. Here we are buying industrial alcohol from France, when they could convert these potatoes into industrial alcohol. But having supported the French beet industry, they want to buy alcohol from France.

Mr. McCORMACK. Other countries do not buy anything from us, do they? I understand my friend's views very well.

Mr. FELLOWS. I do not believe the gentleman does understand them.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's knowledge in that respect is very limited.

Mr. FELLOWS. But my knowledge is limited only in that respect. The gentleman seems to have trouble around the entire perimeter.

Mr. McCORMACK. If there was one commodity there was no justification for giving a support price to, it is potatoes. There is no question about that. However, I simply referred to potatoes as an illustration of what the Congress did.

There is one other subject to which I want to refer, and that is the subject of speculation, gambling, on the commodity exchanges. The President of the United States last year made a recommendation that the Government during this emergency be given the power and the authority to control gambling in food on the commodity exchanges of the country. The Committee on Banking and Currency reported out a provision in the National Production Act, that is, the bill as reported out of committee, giving that power. A motion was made on the floor of the House to strike out that provision, and it was carried.

The Commodity Credit Corporation in a report of 6 or 7 weeks ago showed that since Korea, since June 25, 1950, the increase in gambling in food on the commodity exchanges of the country has been tremendous. The responsibility for the inability of our Government to control that gambling rests upon a majority of the Congress of the United States, particularly in this body, who voted to strike that provision out of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I want to ask the gentleman whether the President's recommendation for control of speculation in the commodity exchanges included control of his personal physician at that time?

Mr. MCCORMACK. That is a rather cheap observation, and consistent with what the gentleman—I am sorry, because I have too much respect for the gentleman. I will not say that. I think, on reflection, the gentleman would not want that to stand in the RECORD.

When you get to talking about a man's physician or anything else, and tie that up to what I am talking about, I think the gentleman is too fair-minded to do that.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Not for anything that I consider to be small and beneath the dignity of the House, but I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman wanted to place responsibility on the Members of the House for failure to control the country generally, and certainly their control over the country is no greater than the President's control over that man who is a prime example of the lack of any kind of control.

Mr. MCCORMACK. All I can say to the gentleman is that I made some remarks yesterday with reference to a brief statement made by another gentleman. I said yesterday that I think it is low and contemptible to make personal attacks on anyone, particularly the President of the United States.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, representation has been made that there are only 3,500 employees here. On examination of the record of the supplemental budget on pages 173 and 174, the record shows there are 2,017 employees in the Department and 4,200 employees in the field.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

ANNUITIES, LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE WIDOWS

For payment of annuities as authorized by the act of August 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 465), \$204,500.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it would be appropriate, in view of the discussion which has just taken place regarding the number of employees in one agency, to call attention to the increase in employment generally in Government. When this budget request came from the President, that is through the Bureau of the Budget, to the Committee on Appropriations, and thus to the Congress, it contained a request for \$20,000,000 for the decentralization, so-called, of Government agencies. That, I think, very properly was sent by the subcommittee to the legislative committee for action. But this is what I want to call to your attention, Mr. Chairman. Decentralization is not the only method at hand to

meet that sort of problem, and yet it seems to be the only method known to the agencies of Government. Many of the agencies of Government today are still working on a 40-hour week. We are talking about \$20,000,000—a request for \$20,000,000 in the budget to move only 19,000 people. In the hearings before you, or which will shortly be before you, there will be evidence that there would be no hope of moving 19,000 people. There is a possible hope of moving half that number; or on the basis of the experience of one agency recently, of moving 40 percent of those people. Thus we are talking about moving 8,000 people for \$20,000,000, leaving the other 11,000 people here to take employment in other agencies and adding 11,000 people at the locations to which the agencies would be moved.

I suggest further that if there are, in defense employment alone, in the city of Washington, 80,490 people, and if they would increase their week's work, they would be able to absorb the entire amount of work without any additional employment, and thus obviate the need of space.

The number of Government employees in February was 2,307,904. The number in the Defense Department, exclusive of people in uniform, and excluding AEC and TVA and NACA, was 1,099,678 employees, which is a tremendous number.

So my suggestion is that before we consider spending \$20,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to move 8,000 people, in order to make that much space in Washington, we consider first working a 44-hour week in time of emergency, or even 48 hours a week if this is war.

Second, that we consider, in some of the most critical agencies, working two shifts a day; third, that we consider a very definite increase in the procedural efficiency of the agencies.

I will give you an illustration of what can be done. The General Accounting Office has been applying that policy to their own procedures, and in 5 years has reduced the number of employees in that one agency from 14,904 to 7,063, a reduction of 7,841 without loss of efficiency.

Finally, when we do consider moving, that we move with some discretion, moving entire agencies out of Washington to leave them permanently out of Washington where they can be as well and permanently located in other parts of the country. Then and then only should we come to the question of whether or not we should disperse temporarily because of a war emergency.

Mr. Chairman, the situation is much more serious than I think the Members of Congress generally realize. The Justice Department in 5 years, in the administration of the present President only—and I have taken that because it covers the present emergency—we have increased the Justice Department 9,033 employees, or 37 percent. We have increased the National Labor Relations Board 64 percent, or from 884 to 1,466 employees. We have increased the Civil Service Commission from 3,656 to 4,570, an increase of 29 percent. We have increased the Commerce Department by 10,082 employees in 5 years, or 26 percent. The Federal Security, 6,204, or 12

percent. The State Department, 2,765 employees, or 11 percent. The Post Office Department, 5 percent, or 20,967 employees, all in the 5 years of the administration of the present President. This is the real problem, not whether we shall spend \$20,000,000 to move 8,000 people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

VESSEL OPERATIONS REVOLVING FUND

For working capital for the "Vessel operations revolving fund," which is hereby created for the purpose of carrying out vessel operating functions of the Secretary of Commerce, including charter, operation, maintenance, repair, reconditioning, and betterment of merchant vessels under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce, \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time so that I might ask a question of some member of the committee concerning the item of \$20,000,000 for working capital for the "Vessel operations revolving fund." I am informed that this fund has reached a sufficiently low level that there are now not sufficient funds for the repair of vessels that should be put in operation, coming out of the laid-up fleet. In at least one instance an operator has agreed to advance the repair costs, with an agreement on the part of the Maritime Administration that it will be reimbursed.

My question is, If such repairs are made and completed before this bill becomes law, would the Maritime Administration be authorized to use a part of this fund to reimburse such an operator?

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. ALLEN of California. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I propounded that exact question to Admiral Cochrane, now Administrator of the Maritime Commission, and he stated that the language in the bill is in there for that purpose, exactly to do that job.

Mr. ALLEN of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, in order to expedite the matter and save time, I ask unanimous consent that all on page 14, beginning with line 4, through pages 14, 15, and 16, be considered as one paragraph, for the simple reason that it is all interrelated matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. TABER. May we have that request repeated?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all of the language on page 14 starting with line 4 through line 24 on page 16 be considered en bloc.

Mr. TABER. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(The balance of the matter referred to follows:)

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rates for shipping services rendered under said fund shall be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, and the fund shall

be credited with all receipts from vessel operating activities conducted thereunder: *Provided*, That the provisions of sections 1 (a), 1 (c), 3 (c) and 4 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress (57 Stat. 45), as amended, shall be applicable in connection with such operations and to seamen employed through general agents as employees of the United States, who may be employed in accordance with customary commercial practices in the maritime industry, notwithstanding the provisions of any law applicable in terms to the employment of persons by the United States: *Provided further*, That such sums as may be determined to be necessary by the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, but not exceeding 2 percent of vessel operating expenses, may be advanced from this fund to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses" for the purposes of that appropriation in connection with vessel operating functions, but without regard to the limitations on amounts as stated therein: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the unexpended balances of any working funds or of allocation accounts established, subsequent to January 1, 1951, for the activities provided for under this appropriation, together with receipts heretofore and hereafter received from such activities, may be transferred to and consolidated with this fund, which shall be available for the purposes of such working funds or allocation accounts.

No money appropriated by this or any other act may be used for the payment to the owner on account of the purchase, requisition, or loss for which the United States is responsible of any vessel previously sold by the United States in an amount in excess of the price paid the United States depreciated as hereinafter provided, plus depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel, subsequent to such sale by the United States: *Provided*, That, in the case of any vessel the price of which has been adjusted pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, the payment shall not exceed the statutory sales price of such vessel as of March 8, 1946, depreciated, plus the depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel subsequent to such date: *Provided further*, That in the case of a bona fide purchaser for value, the payment may equal but not exceed the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hand of such purchaser determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code. If any vessel previously sold by the United States is chartered or taken for use by the United States, the charter hire paid for bareboat use of the vessel shall not be based on a value in excess of the payment permitted under the preceding provisions in case the vessel were purchased by the United States. Depreciation under the preceding provisions shall be computed in accordance with the schedule adopted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for income-tax purposes, or, in the absence of any such schedule, depreciation shall be computed at the rate of 5 percent per annum. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, neither the Secretary of Commerce nor the Federal Maritime Board shall determine, for any purpose whatsoever, a valuation for any vessel previously sold by the United States, except in accordance with the preceding provisions.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Maine restate his point of order?

Mr. HALE. The point of order is that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and it is a very complicated and elaborate piece of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Maine be specific and point out the exact words?

Mr. THOMAS. I wonder if the gentleman from Maine will restate his point of order citing us page number and line number.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, my point of order lies to that paragraph beginning on page 14, line 12 and the succeeding paragraph down to the end of page 16. They are full of legislation. I admit that there may be some language in the two paragraphs that is not legislation, but it seems to me that legislation is so intertwined with appropriations that it is almost impossible to separate them. I think the gentleman must admit that when the bill says that the provisions of public law so and so, as amended, shall be applicable to such and such operations, it is clearly legislation.

Mr. THOMAS. I wonder if the gentleman from Maine will be good enough to withhold his point of order. I say frankly to the gentleman from Maine that if he insists on his point of order, the committee is ready to admit that it is good. But this is language requested by the Maritime Commission itself. They say it will serve a very useful purpose, and I am advised that without this it would really be a subsidy for the Club Thirteen in that they are seeking to put upon the Government the least profitable business while they maintain the profitable business. I just say that to point out to the gentleman what is involved. If the gentleman wants to strike it out on a point of order we must admit that the point of order is good, because it does constitute legislation, but it is legislation submitted by the Maritime Commission itself which was considered point by point by the committee.

Mr. HALE. My point is that if we are to legislate at the instance of the Maritime Administration—and I do not think the Maritime Commission is necessarily right—then we ought to legislate in a more considered and deliberate way than we can in an appropriation bill.

I am frank to say that I do not understand what the effect of these legislative provisions will be. The effect might be salutary but it does not seem to me that an appropriation bill is the way to get at the problem. I am perfectly willing to do anything that is in the interest of orderly procedure to straighten this questions out. I am not trying to be technical.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman from California, myself, and the other members of the committee will attempt to answer any question the gentleman wants to ask about it. We think we have some knowledge on this matter and if we cannot answer the gentleman's question we will be frank with him and tell we do not know.

Mr. HALE. I will be glad to sit down with the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from California with a view to working out the matter, but I do not

want the Record to show that the point of order is waived, if the point of order can be withheld in some way.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Would it be in order to ask unanimous consent that the point of order of the gentleman from Maine be held in suspense for a designated period and that the reading of the bill continue until a conference can be held so that we may indicate why the language is in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may reserve a point of order if he so desires.

Mr. PHILLIPS. My inquiry is, Would the gentleman lose his right under the point of order if the reading of the bill continued in the interval? I ask unanimous consent that he do not lose that right.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, this section will be passed over and returned to when we finish.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, I object to that at this time. May I ask the gentleman from Maine against what provisions exactly in the bill does his point of order lie?

Mr. HALE. I made the point of order to the two paragraphs which begin on page 14, line 12, through to the end of page 16.

Mr. HART. Against all of the remainder of the section?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. HART. May I ask the gentleman from Texas with specific reference to the words on page 15, line 16, "or any other"?

Mr. THOMAS. I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey that the words "or any other" are merely a catch-all limitation that if funds are subsequently appropriated or now in existence by which they can be spent for this purpose—

Mr. HART. I would like to invite the gentleman's attention also to the words "any other law" page 16, line 20, then I would like to ask the gentleman whether those specific phrases to which I have referred constitute language approved by the Federal Maritime Board?

Mr. THOMAS. I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey that every word of this language was written by the Federal Maritime Board, submitted to the committee and adopted by the committee.

Mr. HART. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. HALE. That legislation would normally come before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. If the whole of the language from line 14, page 14, to the end of page 16 is passed over, it would all be considered en bloc and be open to points of order and amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent.

Mr. TABER. If the unanimous-consent request is agreed to,

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

NIAGARA POWER DEVELOPMENT

For engineering and economic investigations, pending authorization for construction, of projects for development and utilization for power purposes of the waters of the Niagara River, allocated to the United States under the treaty between the United States of America and Canada signed February 27, 1950, and ratified by the United States Senate on August 9, 1950, to remain available until expended, \$450,000.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order to the language appearing on page 17, lines 9 to 18, inclusive, as an appropriation not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any member of the committee wish to be heard?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I shall quote from Cannon's Precedents.

Section 1142 reads as follows:

A treaty providing for mutual reports by contracting nations to an international bureau was held to sanction appropriations for the bureau's maintenance although no treaty had been entered into providing for establishment of the bureau.

Section 1138 reads:

A treaty establishing an international institute authorizes an appropriation in a general appropriation bill for sending delegates to the institute.

In the specific treaty I quote from article 7:

The United States of America and Canada shall each designate a representative who, acting jointly, shall ascertain and determine the amounts of water available for the purposes of this treaty, and shall record the same, and shall also record the amounts of water used for power diversions.

In order for these representatives of the two governments to carry on and to ascertain the possibilities of the use of this water it is necessary to have a preliminary survey. It does not seem possible to effect a division of the waters without such a survey. It deals with the topographical condition and the strata of the earth in the vicinity, the rock formations, changes in hydraulics, and such, and for that reason I feel that this is within the scope of consideration at this time, and the point of order should not lie.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has quoted from the treaty, article 7. May I suggest to the Chairman that when that matter was presented to the Senate for ratification and the Senate ratified the treaty, it did so with the following reservation which the gentleman from Michigan did not read.

I quote the reservation. It goes on to say:

That whereas the Senate of the United States of America by their resolution of August 9, 1950, two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, did advise and consent to the ratification of the said treaty with the following reservation:

"The United States on its part expressly reserves the right to provide by act of Congress for redevelopment, for the public use and benefit, of the United States share of the waters of the Niagara River made available by the provisions of the treaty, and no project for redevelopment of the United States share of such waters shall be undertaken until it be specifically authorized by act of Congress."

Subsequently that was ratified and accepted by Canada.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman press his point of order?

Mr. FENTON. I certainly do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The point of order has been made that the item appearing on page 17, lines 9 to 18, inclusive, for Niagara power development is not authorized by law. It will be noted that the language of the proposed appropriation provides for investigations pending authorizations for construction of projects for power purposes of the waters of the Niagara River allocated to the United States under the treaty between the United States of America and Canada signed February 27, 1950, and ratified by the United States Senate on August 9, 1950.

The Chair has examined a copy of the treaty and finds that the treaty provides in some detail for distribution of the water which flows over the Niagara Falls between the United States and Canada and then in article 7 provides:

The United States of America and Canada shall each designate a representative, who, acting jointly, shall ascertain and determine the amounts of water available for the purposes of this treaty, and shall record the same, and shall also record the amounts of water for power diversions.

It has long been settled that a duly ratified treaty to which the United States is party constitutes authority of law for appropriations. And it has also been settled by decisions of the Chair that the treaty need not specifically authorize specific appropriations. It is necessary only that the proposed appropriations be directly necessary to enable the United States to carry out the obligations it has assumed under the treaty. For example, in volume 7 of Cannon's Precedents, section 1138, a decision is recorded holding that where the United States has entered into a treaty establishing an international institute it is in order to appropriate the necessary funds to send delegates to the institute. It was further held in section 1142, volume 7, Cannon's Precedents, that a treaty providing for mutual reports by contracting parties to an international bureau was held to sanction appropriations for the bureau's maintenance although no treaty had been entered into providing for the establishment of the bureau itself.

It seems clear, therefore, that the proposed appropriation is entirely within the purview of the treaty, as its only purpose is to provide the necessary funds for the United States to pay the expenses of the duly authorized representative of the United States acting under article 7 of the treaty.

The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. TABER. Will the Chair permit me to make a little observation in that connection?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Under that provision under which the treaty authorizes action to be taken, on page 5 in this bill we have provided for \$36,500 for the operations of this treaty within the range of the treaty. This power proposition is an entirely different thing, and beyond it. It seems to me we are going far afield in connection with the operation of a treaty and going into something that has never heretofore been allowed. I just wish to have that in front of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will refer to line 11 on page 17 he will find that it reads:

For engineering and economic investigations, pending authorization for construction, of projects for development and utilization—

The Chair has ruled.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that we have already in this very same bill done just exactly as the Chair indicated when he overruled my point of order. On page 5 of the present bill, under Department of State, the Chair will find we allow \$36,500 for the very purposes the Chair has indicated.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this ruling of the Chairman is very important. My inquiry is whether the Chairman, in making the ruling which he has, has intended to take cognizance of the reservation made by the other body in its ratification of the treaty.

In other words, as I view it, the precedents to which the Chairman has referred have to do only with cases where a treaty has been ratified, which we all recognize becomes the law of the land. None of them apply to the case where the other body in its ratification of the treaty has made an express reservation of the right to provide by act of Congress for redevelopment or anything else.

In other words, none of the cases referred to by the Chairman are parallel to the situation here presented since there is no similar language by the other body when the ratification of the treaty takes place. My inquiry, therefore, is, because this is I feel an important precedent, whether the Chairman intends, in making this ruling, to include in his decision a consideration of the language

employed by the other body in its ratification of the treaty.

The CHAIRMAN. In the brief time that the Chair has had to study this matter, the Chair has made a ruling on the question and the rule stands.

So far as the reservation is concerned, it relates to construction of developmental works and, since the language included in the bill relating only to preliminary investigations could not under any circumstance be considered as authorizing construction, the Chair must hold that the reservation does not affect the situation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 17, line 18, after "\$450,000", strike out the period and substitute a comma therefor, and insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation Flood control, general."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The purpose of this amendment is twofold. First of all it would reestablish what was a unanimous decision of the subcommittee which held hearings, and secondly, it would reaffirm that decision by providing that this money should be derived by transfer from flood control, general, instead of through new funds. That was the way it was requested by the Corps of Engineers when the request was brought to us. They did not ask for any new money. They asked to have it by transfer. The subcommittee approved of that. Then on Friday, the full committee, after some discussion but without any record vote, decided to make it new money instead. Frankly, I was not in attendance at the meeting when that was done. Perhaps some may think it comes with poor grace from one who was not there to then attack what appeared to be the majority viewpoint of the full committee. But where you do have first of all a matter of spending new money or transferring it from old money involved, and where you do have a unanimous recommendation of the subcommittee involved, I do believe it is proper for me to raise that issue here on the floor.

I think it should be made clear there are two parts to this Niagara project as included in the bill before us. One of them is remedial and I think in that respect there is no question but that that could be done under the treaty.

I think, on the other hand, there is a very definite question, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out, as to whether this survey for power development can be done without the specific authorization of the Congress. But since that issue has been decided, and we are not entitled to further discuss that today, the issue now becomes: Shall we take it out of previously authorized money, as was requested, and as the subcommittee said unanimously that it should be done, or should it be taken out of a new appropriation?

I think it should be made clear also that this is not a door-opening proposition. First of all, the report says that "it is to be understood by the Corps of Engineers that the approval of this item does not commit the Congress to the ap-

proval of subsequent requests for appropriations for plans, surveys, or construction of this project."

That was put in in view of the fact that in the request for the fiscal year 1952, now before the subcommittee, there is \$2,000,000 for furtherance of this project. The gentleman from Michigan who was in charge of the hearings the day they were held, and held very fairly, agreed with the members of the subcommittee that we would wait and see what happened as a result of this \$450,000 appropriation after they had gone out and looked over the drilling and so on before we took any further action on it. So I think perhaps that makes this a completely justifiable project that would not commit us to the spending of huge sums of money in the future, which is always the danger in initial appropriations of this kind.

The reason, as I understand it, why the full committee decided to take it from new money was because of some concern over the fact that existing flood-control projects would be curtailed if this money were transferred. That is not the case. Under the Thomas-Taber amendment, section 1214 of last year's appropriation act, the President was directed to cut down \$550,000,000. He did more than that. Part of that excess over the amount he was ordered to cut by the Congress came in this particular field of flood control generally. So at the present time there is an amount of frozen funds in excess of what the Congress ordered the President to do. It is from that money that would now be released under this legislation that this project in the Niagara River would be initiated, but it would not affect any single or identifiable flood-control project now in existence or in progress throughout any part of the United States.

I think those of you who feel they are going to take the money from projects already appropriated for, and going to open the door to huge expenditures in the future, can rest assured that that is not the case and that the subcommittee did examine that construction quite carefully at the time of the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes, and that I be recognized.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I object. I am a member of the committee and I would like to speak for 5 minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. I modify the request, Mr. Chairman, to ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this is six of one and a half-dozen of another.

In the first place, in the conference report on the omnibus appropriation bill last year there were amendments by the House and amendments by the Senate under consideration to make the final cut. I was chairman of the central committee, and we finally agreed on a com-

promise. That compromise cut was that the Bureau of the Budget be directed to cut at least \$550,000,000 from the bill. When the Bureau of the Budget finally got through with its work it concluded with a cut of some \$580,000,000. The language "at least" in the amendment gave flexibility to the fund between \$550,000,000 and \$580,000,000 to the Bureau of the Budget. It was from this flexible fund that they sought to take this money. We tried so to explain it to the full Committee on Appropriations, but the Committee on Appropriations finally made a decision that we would not disturb that fund and that they would give new money for the project. I do not think there was one dissenting vote. They just accepted the idea of the change.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] has confessed himself that he was not there. So it is a matter of his opinion on this as against the full committee. I am willing to admit with the gentleman that I favored this as it was originally brought in by the Corps of Engineers, but when there was objection before the full committee they thought it would be better to place new funds, and leave frozen the same amount of money in the Bureau of the Budget, I agreed. So, as I said in the beginning, it is six of one and a half-dozen of another. It does not make any difference to me what way it is done, but the full committee decided to appropriate new funds.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Michigan and I appreciate the very fair way in which this matter and other matters we have had in our subcommittee have been handled by him, but I cannot quite agree with the gentleman when he says that it is my opinion against the whole committee. Actually what my amendment does is to attempt to substantiate the unanimous opinion of the Army engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and the subcommittee which held the hearings on the item.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman knows that the Army engineers present the proposition, but Congress decides the manner in which it is to be handled, and the subcommittee did decide to go along their way. But the subcommittee is only one of the children of the full Committee on Appropriations, and when the full Committee on Appropriations decides to do it another way I agreed.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot entertain such a request, because time has been limited on this amendment.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is recognized.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, you will find from the House report that under this title there is the only plus sign before the figures in the right-hand column of the subcommittee report. Except for changes made by the full Committee on Appropriations on this para-

graph there would have been no plus signs. I do not know what designation we would have used, but at least we would not have increased the funds.

Here is what happened in the full committee. It was a rather confusing parliamentary situation, and I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] will agree that it was. Some discussion did come up in the full committee as to whether or not the allowance of this transfer item would have taken away funds from any flood-control project or planning. The members of the subcommittee tried to point out that in actuality it would not hurt any flood-control project or planning. Apparently we were not successful, and an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] which finally prevailed. That amendment resulted in the increase as shown on page 1 of the committee report. At the same time an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] to strike the entire paragraph from the bill. Actually I was not entirely clear as to what the parliamentary situation was in the full committee, and as a result I asked the chairman of the full committee to clarify it. While this confusing parliamentary situation prevailed we had two quick votes. I am not condemning anybody but I do say that the situation was completely confusing. There was approval given to the Whitten amendment, but I wish to correct the gentleman from Michigan, there were some votes in opposition to the Whitten amendment. I voted against it myself because I did not want to go on record as increasing any item in this bill. It was a voice vote and perhaps in the confusion one could not hear what was being done. I emphasize, however, there were some votes in opposition to the Whitten amendment. I repeat I voted against it myself.

I intend to support the Davis amendment and if the Davis amendment does not prevail I intend to support any amendment which will strike this paragraph from the bill. We of the subcommittee felt that this transfer of \$450,000 could honestly be approved. As a transfer item, it would not increase the appropriations, and it would not in any way harm flood control projects or planning. I cannot support an increase in appropriations so will support an effort to strike the paragraph if the Davis amendment fails.

At the time we on the subcommittee got the justifications in the first instance I immediately wondered whether there would not be a sound point of order against this item. It so happens that I served on the Committee on Public Works during the Eighty-first Congress. In the Eighty-first Congress legislation was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] and in the other body by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] authorizing the Niagara River power development. Hearings were held but no action was taken on the legislation. Now we come to this point in the consideration of the present bill and find we may appropriate \$450,000 for a project that is not yet authorized by law.

With due deference to the Chair and the recent ruling, I do not think it can be justified. I think the paragraph should have been stricken on the point of order. However, I will go along with it as long as it is a transfer item and not a new appropriation. I am very much in favor of the Davis amendment which returns this paragraph to the form in which it was submitted to us by the President and submitted to us by the Army Corps of Engineers. The Davis amendment is the language which was approved by our subcommittee. I sincerely hope we will return to the language which met the approval initially of those I have mentioned, including the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], myself, and the other Members who were sitting on that subcommittee. As I indicated before it was submitted to us in that form by the President and by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. As I said in my remarks, it is six of one and half a dozen of the other. The only reason I am speaking for it and the manner in which it is presented to the House is on instructions from the full committee. That is the position I find myself in.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Michigan, because of the action of the full committee, is put into a position not of his own making.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 64, noes 14.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in carrying out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.), including purchase (not to exceed five) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); reimbursement of the Civil Service Commission for full field investigations of employees occupying positions of critical importance from the standpoint of national security; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with civil defense functions; \$1,750,000: *Provided*, That \$110,000 shall be available for providing civil defense communications systems pursuant to subsection (c) of section 201 of said act.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that everyone in the House wants to achieve economy, and we are here for that purpose, but I am amazed at the way we are trying to achieve economy at the expense of civil defense. I think we are being penny-wise and pound-foolish

in this instance, because we are gambling, for the sake of a few dollars, with the lives and the production facilities of our whole war economy. It must be obvious to anyone who has studied the problem of national security that unless our home front and its war-production facilities are adequately guarded by civil defense we can lose a war overnight, despite what our military services may be able to do in retaliation against an enemy.

On January 2 we passed the Civil Defense Act, which provided as a policy that—

The Federal Government shall provide necessary coordination and guidance; shall be responsible for the operations of the Federal Civil Defense Administration as set forth in this act; and shall provide necessary assistance as hereinafter authorized.

The role of civil defense is to prepare the civil population so that it can endure and resist all forms of hostile attack without confusion and loss of morale, and carry on the industrial war effort of the Nation without serious impairment. If these objectives are obtained, no opponent can win a decisive victory by a direct assault against the civilian population alone. On the other hand, if civil defense fails, the chances for the Nation to survive a full-scale assault is doubtful.

Now, I would like to point out in the appropriation that our committee is recommending what a terrific cut has been made in our civil defense activities. The Civil Defense Authority came before the Committee on Appropriations and requested a program for fire-fighting service of \$6,840,000 to match State funds of a like amount. That was to procure fire-fighting equipment, hose, and other things to put a fire out in case an area was hit by bomb attack. Our committee appropriated exactly nothing for this contingency. Under warden service, civil defense requested 200,000 hand extinguishers at a sum of \$2,733,000. Our committee has appropriated exactly nothing for that contingency. For engineering service, to provide for water pipe and chemical plants to operate in stricken areas after a bomb attack, in order to provide pure emergency water, civil defense requested \$11,330,000, and the committee appropriated exactly nothing. For conversion of 20,000 trucks and vehicles into emergency ambulances, a request was made for \$1,500,000, and the committee appropriated exactly nothing. On rescue service, to clear people from debris and fallen buildings and to dynamite wrecked buildings after a bomb attack, the request was for \$500,000, and we have appropriated exactly nothing.

We need warning and communication systems, to intercept air attacks or submarine attacks that may come upon our country. While we have a radar screen set up by the Air Force, we need some sort of relay system to transmit the warnings to attack areas so they can prepare for a bombing raid. The military is not equipped to perform this service. It is strictly civilian defense. Adequate warning can save millions of lives.

A request was made for \$5,788,000 for this purpose. Yet the committee reports an unworkable sum of \$110,000.

You can imagine what you can set up in the way of a national air-raid alarm system for \$110,000. This is extravagance; not economy.

Another appalling lack of foresight or understanding is for medical services such as organizational equipment, stockpiling of essential materials, and operating costs. A request was made for some \$75,638,000. Our committee has appropriated exactly nothing.

On welfare service, providing cots and blankets for stricken people in areas that are bombed, a request was made for \$15,426,000, and exactly nothing was appropriated by the committee.

For training and education, \$787,000 was asked for and surprisingly enough \$890,000 was appropriated. That is fine, but what good are trained volunteers if they have no medical supplies, no fire-fighting equipment, no ambulances, and no water supply?

For research and development to improve medication and communication equipment, a request was made for \$3,875,000. Again, not a cent was provided.

We come down to shelters and protective facilities. The civil-defense authorities have admitted that bomb shelters are not a very practical means of providing for civil defense. In fact civil-defense authorities testified that that item should be cut down. Yet this is the largest single appropriation, save one.

We come down to the procurement fund, a revolving fund in order to buy supplies to furnish to the States, who later repay the Federal organization. Twenty-five million dollars was asked for and \$5,000,000 was actually granted.

But the pay-off comes in the emergency fund. Mind you, the committee has refused to appropriate anything for fire-fighting service, for warden service, for engineering service, for transportation service, or for a warning and communications system, except for \$110,000. But the committee created an emergency fund for postwar attack. Once we are down on our knees, without medical supplies, without ambulances and fire-fighting equipment, without any tools for reconstruction we then have an emergency fund of \$100,000,000.

I do not know what a stricken area is going to do with the money by that time, unless you use the greenbacks as bandages. Then it is too late to set up a protective system or to do anything worth while about taking care of these stricken people or reducing the chaos or confusion that comes from an atomic attack.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to compliment the gentleman on the very plain and forceful presentation he is making at this time. The gentleman is exactly right. We should do nothing to curtail these funds that are appropriated for civil defense. Anyone that has visited the bombed cities of Europe and Japan, incidentally, will know the terrific havoc that war causes and will know that in the last analysis you have to depend upon the civilian population. In order

to take care of the civilian population, you cannot depend upon the military, because they are busy doing something else.

I want to point out a couple of sentences on page 36 of the committee report. One is:

At the present time there exists a wholly adequate and efficient civilian attack warning system in the Air Force, and the committee can see no need for the civil defense personnel to take over this work.

That just simply is not true. We do not have an adequate civil defense warning system in the Air Force. It is totally inadequate, and anyone who has studied it knows it. In the following paragraph it says:

The committee recommends that an effective radar system be set up.

You can set up a radar system, but the radar system cannot be effective because planes can come in at low altitudes and will not show up on the radar screens. Therefore, the gentleman is making a very important speech at this time, and I commend him for it and hope the committee will listen very carefully to his further remarks.

Mr. McKINNON. I thank the gentleman. I might add that all the coast cities are very susceptible to atomic attack by submarine. There is no defense against that. It is up to us to begin to give some thought and make some preparation as to what we are going to do in defense, not only of our lives but also in furtherance of the war effort which cannot be prosecuted if an atomic attack destroys the morale and productive facilities of our country.

In this committee report, on page 36 the committee has pointed out that it has not seen fit to grant civilian defense any great amount of money for the simple reason that the plan is nebulous in nature, and that, besides, the money will not be spent in 1951, and therefore should not be appropriated in 1951. Anyone knows that the money we are authorizing on the war effort, the \$42,000,000,000 provided for bombers and tanks and many other weapons of war, is not going to be spent in 1951. We all understand that thoroughly, and yet we wisely vote the funds to strengthen the war effort as fast as our factories can turn out the weapons. But instead of recognizing the similarity between military effort and civilian defense, the committee hid its head in the sand and says that because we cannot get everything done in civil defense by the end of this calendar year, then nothing should be done. This is nonsense of the first order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a question.

It has been my understanding that Federal funds would be available on a 50-50 basis to match State appropriations for civil defense in certain categories, particularly for the stockpiling of medical supplies, fire-fighting equipment, and other such items.

During the month of February, it is my understanding that the Connecticut General Assembly appropriated \$300,000 for emergency medical supplies. It did so on the assumption that an additional \$300,000 would be available from the Federal Government on a matching basis.

This proper action by the State government was taken in order to safeguard the lives and homes of the people and to protect against possible damage the Connecticut defense industries from which such vital contribution to the defense effort is properly expected.

I rise to ask this question, If the State of Connecticut, subsequent to the enactment of the Federal Civil Defense Act obligated this \$300,000 prior to the enactment of a Federal appropriation for this purpose, would the additional \$300,000 be made available from Federal funds?

If not, I hope proper legislative action may be taken so that those States which were quick to recognize and act promptly in the interest of civil defense will not be discriminated against.

Mr. WHITTEN. This matter has been taken up with the Civil Defense Administration. Their reply in part is as follows:

Various arguments have been presented to justify or decline applications for contributions for the purpose of reimbursing the States for past expenditures. The act does not specifically authorize such reimbursement, although it refers to "programs or projects approved by the Administrator" which seems to imply that the programs or projects look to future activities rather than to past expenditures. The General Accounting Office has ruled in at least one other situation that financial contributions cannot be made to cover expenditures or obligations incurred prior to the date funds are appropriated for the particular purpose. (Comptroller General Decision No. A-71315, February 28, 1936.) However, this precedent is not controlling and the legislative history of the act is not conclusive on the point.

In justification of the retroactive financial contributions it can be said that since the act is silent on the point, there can be no prohibition against such contributions and the Administrator is free to act. Further, the refusal to approve penalizes the more alert and progressive States and will generally discourage civil defense activities. It has been said that previous advice to the States to prepare for civil defense implied, at least, a willingness to aid the States financially for civil defense expenditures. Such advice has been issued to the States from time to time since the Hopley report issued in October 1948 by the Department of Defense.

It is our view now that contributions should not be authorized by the Administrator for the purpose of reimbursing States on a retroactive basis for civil defense expenditures for the following reasons:

(1) One of the strong presumptions in our jurisprudence is that statutes operate prospectively only. The presumption is not conclusive, but statutes will not be construed as operating retroactively unless such construction is required by clear, strong, and imperative language or by necessary implication. Indeed, such language as there is looks the other way. The Administrator is to make no contributions except on the basis of plans and programs approved by him, and in order to assure compliance with his plans and programs he may impose such reasonable conditions as he chooses upon the making of contributions. Where an expenditure is al-

ready made it is obvious that, unless it fits 100 percent into the Administrator's plans and programs, nothing can be done to make it do so.

Now, that seems to be the opinion of the Civil Defense Administrator.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In view of that answer, I hope that proper legislative action can be taken so that those States which were quick to recognize and to act promptly in the interest of civil defense will not be unnecessarily penalized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we are here asked for a \$1,750,000 hand-out to the Federal Civil Defense Administration. Part of the money could be used for so-called meetings, extravaganzas such as the one planned at the Statler Hotel, in Washington, on May 7 and 8, as announced by Administrator Caldwell on April 5, whereby about 1,000 civil-defense officials and governors are being called in for pep talks, reportedly to include one by President Truman.

It might interest the Members to know that while this agency is asking us for automobiles and money for so-called meetings to beat the civil-defense drums that same agency recently played a most unsavory part in practically strangling the civil-defense program of Waterloo, Iowa.

Perhaps Waterloo is not the only victim of the propaganda and lip service indulged in by the Federal Civil Defense Administration. If the experience of Waterloo is typical, we had better delete the additional civil-defense appropriation in this bill and proceed to order the liquidation of the agency.

The sell-out of the Waterloo program is detailed in the following letter that I wrote to Administrator Caldwell on April 7, and to which I have had no written reply thus far:

APRIL 7, 1951.

Mr. MILLARD F. CALDWELL, Jr.,
Administrator, Federal Civil Defense
Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. CALDWELL: In view of a recent run-around accorded the city of Waterloo, Iowa, in which your agency played a part, I read with interest and amazement a statement attributed to you by the Washington Evening Star of April 5, 1951.

According to that newspaper, you asserted, in announcing a meeting of more than 1,000 civil-defense directors and governors to be held at the Statler Hotel in Washington on May 7 and 8:

"The most immediate enemy of the American public is apathy toward its own danger."

A recitation of the following facts will demonstrate, I believe, that you placed the shoe on the wrong foot; that certain mobilization agencies in the National Capital, including your own, are guilty of apathy instead of the American public, at least as far as Waterloo is concerned.

That city, one of the largest in the Midwest in terms of industrial production, went to the considerable trouble, in good faith, to raise \$35,000 to put into effect a civil-defense program to protect its citizens and factories, including those engaged in defense production, and placed orders for the necessary equipment. In addition, private industry in Waterloo is providing and paying the expenses of more than 100 individuals to be trained by the city fire department to handle the equipment. Here is one civil-defense program that is not costing the Federal Government a single dime.

A main factor in any civil-defense program is, of course, fire-fighting apparatus, but apparently that obvious fact is not known to the mobilizers in Washington, D. C.

On January 15, 1951, the city of Waterloo placed an order with the Construction Machinery Co., Waterloo, for 10 trailer-mounted fire pumps, single stage, model M-4 centrifugal fire pumps, powered with electric starting 6-cylinder Chrysler, model Ind-7 engine, capacity 500 gallons per minute at 120 pounds.

The above-named company, however, was unable to complete the order due to a lack of necessary materials. A priority was needed.

Therefore, on March 14, 1951, Lawrence A. Touchae, mayor of Waterloo, addressed a letter to the Industry Operations Bureau of the National Production Authority requesting the priority, and sent me a carbon copy of his communication which I received on March 16.

I immediately wrote to Horace B. McCoy, chief of the Industry Operations Bureau, urging him to expedite the mayor's request.

Almost daily thereafter, beginning on March 19, my office telephoned Mr. McCoy's office in an effort to ascertain what was being done with respect to Mayor Touchae's request. For days, however, the Bureau was unable even to locate either the mayor's letter or my letter, as I so informed Mr. Touchae on March 21.

Finally, on March 28, when I was in Iowa during the brief Easter recess of Congress, a Mrs. Armour in Mr. McCoy's office telephoned my assistant, Carl Roth, that the NPA Machinery Division was, that day, issuing the priority and asserted the mayor could be notified to that effect. It was stated that due to processing procedure, several days would elapse before the priority would be in the mayor's hands for transmittal to the company.

More daily telephone calls were made by my office to follow the so-called processing procedure from one office and bureau to another.

At last, on April 5, Mr. Roth was advised by James W. Anderson of the NPA Machinery Division that Mayor Touchae's request had been denied following a meeting of the minds of NPA and the Federal Civil Defense Administration which you command; that your agency reportedly wouldn't recommend a priority and so NPA turned it down, notifying Mayor Touchae by letter on April 3 or 4.

Thus, in the space of a week, my office was informed first, that the priority had been granted, and then that it had been denied.

More telephone calls resulted. A Mr. Odom, assistant to the head of the Fire Equipment Division of your agency, asserted that NPA had asked your agency to make the final decision, but that your agency did not do so, believing it was NPA's responsibility.

A Mrs. Lawrence, in Mr. McCoy's office, admitted that a grievous error was made in notifying my assistant in the first place that the priority was being issued.

From the various conversations I was left with the impression that there is no fixed policy with regard to priorities for equipment of this nature; that the subject is only under study.

Strangely, it was suggested that Mayor Touchae appeal his case, making it stronger, although nobody would make any promises that it would do any good. In my opinion, Mr. Touchae has already stated his case adequately, even to the extent of providing affidavits of approval from Mr. Rodney Q. Selby, Iowa Civil Defense Director, and Mr. George Heath, Civil Defense Director for Black Hawk County, in which Waterloo is located.

Judging from your statement reported in the Star, you and others are beating the

drums for civil defense louder than ever, calling in 1,000 or more citizens from all over the country for pep talks, reportedly to include one from President Truman.

But in view of Waterloo's experience, the logical question is, What's this civil defense business all about? Is it a crying need, as stated?

Do we need it or not? If so, why don't you permit States and municipalities to obtain the necessary equipment?

If civil defense is nothing more than propaganda and lip service, as handed Waterloo, why don't you frankly say so? This would enable Waterloo and other communities to save time, effort, and money in conjuring up a civil-defense program, and would make the proposed meeting at the Statler an unnecessary expense along with the continued operation of your agency and others supposedly connected with civil defense.

Who's apathetic?

Very truly yours,

H. R. GROSS.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the time has come to stop the fumbling and bungling that has been all too apparent in the agencies that have been established to protect the welfare of the people. If the National Production Authority and Federal Civil Defense Administration are so snarled in red tape that they cannot function it is time the people who pay the bills be so advised. There is nothing to prevent the heads of these agencies from uttering a public outcry if they are not being permitted to function properly.

If there is maladministration the public ought to know about that, too, and now.

There can be no ignoring of the facts as I have recited them in the letter I have just read that on one hand the Government is screaming for civil-defense programs and on the other hand denying priorities, at least in the case of Waterloo, Iowa, which would make such a program possible.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. Chairman, such of the statement just made as amounts to an attack on Millard Caldwell can best be answered by simply ignoring it.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I placed in the Record a statement as to exactly what the action of the Appropriation Committee would mean to the civil defense program of this country. I am rather reluctant to disagree with a great committee such as the Committee on Appropriations; I have great respect for it and usually for the last 13 or more years I have followed their views after they have studied the problem and brought it to the floor of the House. But I believe today we have got to think about this thing in a more serious tone than we are thinking about it. I did not ask for the job of working out this civil defense program which I brought to the floor in December of 1950, and which passed this House with but one dissenting vote. We first began considering it in the Atomic Energy Committee because of information we have which cannot be brought to the floor of the House. Those of us who attended the committee meeting this morning are concerned.

The action that we are about to take today, in my opinion, will give us no civil defense program for this country. I am sure no one doubts the ability of Millard Caldwell and his able assistant, Mr. Wadsworth. I do not think two more able men could have been picked to administer this program. Those of us who have served with Millard Caldwell in this House know his integrity, know his ability, and know about his ability to do a job; also we are well acquainted with Mr. Wadsworth, son of a gentleman who served in this House with distinction for years, a man for whom I have high esteem.

Now, I do not come from a critical target area, so it does not involve me as it does you people in the cities of Chicago, New York, San Francisco, and other parts of the country. You are in critical target areas. If you want to take a chance, all right, good and well. I will not. I brought the legislation here, I brought it in good faith, and the House adopted it; so I think it is incumbent upon this body to see that Mr. Caldwell is not completely hamstrung in his effort to carry out a necessary civil defense program in this country. In the proviso which the gentleman preceding me spoke about, involving \$100,000,000, we, after careful study, wrote a legislative proposal. We realized the danger in this legislation. We studied it for 2 years and we put in all of the restrictions in the writing of a piece of legislation that we possibly could to protect this country as we protect our own interests so that it would not be something that the people would laugh at like they did during the last war.

Section 301 is a trigger provision in the legislation and it cannot be put into operation until the bombs are dropped. It is practically martial law, and that is what you would have to have if you receive a bombing in this country. The proviso in this measure which gives them \$100,000,000 will not permit the administrator to touch a cent of it until the bombing is started. That is not good legislation. I am not going to offer an amendment because I do not like to offer amendments to appropriation bills. But I hope the committee will study this proviso. Of course, it will delay the program, the action we are taking today will delay the program regardless of what we do or say; so I am pointing out, I am warning the people who come from critical target areas to think this over in connection with the action you are taking today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take up the time of the House, but I feel I have studied this problem and I am trying to report to the House the knowledge we have gained. I am not sure that the Kremlin is going to start an all-out war, nobody is sure of

that, but it is a possibility. We know they have atomic weapons. They have also the conventional weapons. This is not something to scare anybody, it exists today whether you like it or whether you do not like it, and I feel I would be derelict in my duty if I did not say something in the nature of a warning. If you do not want a civil-defense program, all right, let us junk it, let us get rid of it, but if we are going to have one let us put something back of it and do a decent job.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I am from one of these target areas the gentleman speaks of. I would like to know if the delay to which the gentleman refers is fatal? I would like some assessment of the proposition from the gentleman.

Mr. DURHAM. I would like to make a statement on that with the knowledge I have and with the knowledge that the committee members of the Atomic Energy Committee have, but I will just refrain from doing it. I do not want to scare the country. I do not feel that is necessary, but I do want them to be prepared when and if this thing comes.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman feels he has performed his function when he warns us that we should give this early attention?

Mr. DURHAM. That is what I am doing today.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman heard the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa, who preceded him on the floor, in which he criticized the Administrator of the civil-defense program for warning the country of a danger. Does not the gentleman agree that complacency is rapidly becoming a national evil, that if there is a public enemy No. 1 in the country today it is complacency?

Mr. DURHAM. I thank the gentleman very much.

The status of the State civil-defense appropriation legislation, money which has already been appropriated this year, is \$128,000,000 or more, that is, the States have taken this action, and made and pending legislative proposals is \$202,243,255. The States are acting, and I think it is incumbent on us to take some action that would assure them of a program that they can carry out.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think the gentleman will agree with me that there are two countries who are very realistic in their approach to this problem: One of them is Great Britain and the other is the Soviet Union.

Mr. DURHAM. They never have abandoned the program since World War II.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For financial contributions to the States pursuant to subsection (1) of section 201 of

the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, \$80,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1952: *Provided*, That of this amount \$75,000,000 shall be available only for shelters and other protective facilities: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall not approve any programs or projects for such shelters and protective facilities which cannot be completed as usable units within the limit of the amount of this appropriation and the amounts to be made available by the States to match contributions hereunder.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriation Committee's report on the third deficiency bill disallows \$345,000 for the control of the Engelmann spruce bark beetle epidemic in Colorado. The Committee also states that no further work should be done on this project.

Discontinuance of this project will mean that practically all of the spruce timber in Colorado, Wyoming and New Mexico will be exposed to destruction from this extremely virulent insect epidemic. Already about 4,000,000,000 board feet of spruce timber has been killed in western Colorado which is the largest loss of timber from a single continuous insect epidemic experienced in the United States. There are 16,000,000,000 more feet of timber in the national forests and the Rocky Mountain National Park which now lie in the path of this gigantic outbreak.

The ultimate cost of controlling this huge outbreak is unavoidably large, but failure to control it will result in the greatest timber disaster that this country has ever experienced. It will turn 2,000,000 acres of Colorado's finest green forests into grey ghost forests. These lands are the most important watershed areas in the drainages of the Colorado, Rio Grande, and Platte Rivers. Maintenance of stable soil conditions on the steep slopes of the Rocky Mountains and storage of the snow pack for vital irrigation and power will be jeopardized and in the Colorado Rocky Mountains are one of the Nation's greatest scenic and recreational assets. The green clad timber slopes of these mountains are an essential part of their inspirational beauty and attractiveness. If these green slopes are permitted to be turned into great expanses of dead and fallen timber, it will be a serious blow to the State's recreation industry which is a vital part of its economy.

Perhaps the judgment of the committee was unduly influenced by the relatively lower value of the Colorado spruce forests for lumber. It is true that in comparison with Pacific Coast States and the inland empire there has been relatively little cutting in the Colorado spruce forests. However, this timber is one of the important reserves remaining in the United States and is bound to play an important role in supplying the Nation's needs for forest products as depletion through cutting occurs elsewhere in the West. Already arrangements are virtually completed for the construction of a pulp mill in western Colorado which will provide a major market for this timber. However, this pulp mill cannot be maintained permanently unless the spruce bark beetle project is controlled.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FUND

For working capital for the "Civil defense procurement fund," which is hereby established for the purpose of financing the procurement, by the Administrator, of materials or organizational equipment for which financial contributions to the States are otherwise authorized to be made on a matching basis by subsection (1) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, \$5,000,000. Said fund shall be charged with the purchase price of said materials or equipment, and shall be paid therefor in advance, or by reimbursement, in equal amounts from (1) applicable appropriations and (2) funds provided by the States. Such materials or organizational equipment may be delivered to any State, and the Federal share of the purchase price of materials or organizational equipment so delivered shall be in lieu of equivalent financial contributions therefor.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] who serves on the Atomic Energy Commission for his interest in civil defense, and the fine work he has done on it. I certainly do not want to criticize in any way the committee, because I know they have a job to do on appropriations, but I just cannot help from taking the floor at this time and expressing my concern about this question of a civil-defense program. We realize that a civil-defense program has got to depend on two things, that is, civilian participation and Federal participation. I agree with the committee in the report that a great deal of this has to be done at the grass roots by civilians. We have to absolutely depend on civilians to form the corps that is going to be necessary to operate any kind of a civil-defense program. They found that out in England and France during the last war when the bombers hit; that the military could not do the job. Therefore we have to depend on civilians and they in turn have to depend on the Federal Government for certain things which they cannot do in their individual communities. Among those things are hospital mobilization between communities, and the furnishing of blood substitutes on a national scale. A great deal of research has been done and is being done on this particular point. Especially will they have to depend on stockpiles of medical aid material. I just recently studied this problem, and it might surprise you to know that in most drug stores of the Nation a citizen today that wanted to go in and buy a civilian emergency medical-aid kit cannot find them in the drug stores. Many of the things that are necessary for civilian emergency medical aid in case of fire or bombing or any other type of damage due to war are not available.

That means that the Government is obligated to encourage the production of these emergency medical aids, and it is going to have to stockpile them in the proper fashion in the communities where they are not now available, these strategic areas.

There is a great field where the Federal Government has to function if we are really going to have national civil defense. I want to point out that we

have appropriated \$42,500,000,000 for military defense. I believe this request for \$403,000,000 is a very modest request. It is less than 4 percent. When total war comes it does not come just to the military forces. Our great industrial centers are the targets that will be hit first.

Now I wish to yield to the gentleman from California so that he can complete the point that he was just about to bring out when his time expired.

Mr. McKINNON. I thank the gentleman.

The thing I wanted to bring out is simply this: The Civil Defense Authority asked for \$403,000,000. There was allocated \$186,000,000. Of this \$186,000,000, \$100,000,000 is set aside as an emergency fund to be used after the attack hits, leaving only \$86,000,000 to prepare a program, of which \$75,000,000 is earmarked for questionable shelter construction. This is totally inadequate, and because it is can be extremely costly.

The committee stated that it did not feel it was necessary to appropriate this money because it could not be spent this year, but now is the time for us to begin thinking about this thing and making our contract authorizations if we are going to have a defense organization that can do the job when the attack comes.

The committee further stated that the report was nebulous. Anyone who knows Mr. Caldwell knows he is a good organizer and will build a compact organization. It takes a little while to get started. I also wish to point out the contradiction between the committee report and the committee testimony. The report says the testimony was nebulous, yet Chairman CANNON said at the conclusion of Mr. Caldwell's statement:

We appreciate your statement, Governor. We are very glad we have this matter in such competent hands.

He goes on to state further:

We are very well satisfied with the statement you have given us. You have made a very excellent presentation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I agree with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in his evaluation of Mr. Caldwell. We have had Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Wadsworth before the Atomic Energy Committee in connection with testimony in regard to these and other matters of importance. I will say that I was very favorably impressed with both Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Wadsworth. I believe that the civil defense is in capable hands. I have had some experience with the medical department, and I think they have a very fine staff. We have to do our part as the Congress to help these people so that they can go ahead and do a good job.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER XIII
GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 1301. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that

asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That, as applicable to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the language of the bill on page 23, line 11, after the words "United States" as follows: "or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States."

The language I have read, when coupled with the language in line 18, to which I do not object, makes such person guilty of a felony, and is legislation in an appropriation bill in that you have a loosely drawn criminal statute inserted in an appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if the gentleman's objection is to the penalties contained therein? Is the gentleman opposed to the section, if I may be permitted to inquire of him?

Mr. YORTY. I am not opposed to the section. I am only opposed to that part which makes a person guilty of a felony who might belong to an organization which merely asserted the right to strike against the Government. I am not opening up the question of the right to strike against the Government. That is another subject entirely. If the gentleman will permit me, I would just like to say that under this loosely drawn criminal statute, which in my humble judgment is unconstitutional, a person might be clear out of the country, a government employee, who is a member of an organization, and if that organization then went on record merely asserting that it had the right to strike, he would, by

virtue of that assertion—although he may be opposed to their action—become guilty of a felony. The whole thing just shows in my humble judgment the inadvisability of the Committee on Appropriations endeavoring to write a criminal statute.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YORTY. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman realize that this very provision has been in the appropriation bills for some years now?

Mr. YORTY. I was so informed, yes, sir; but repeating an error or repeating something which is wrong does not make it right.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YORTY. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. In the gentleman's interpretation of that language, does not that set up a blacklist against anybody who ever struck against the Government in the past?

Mr. YORTY. I would not so interpret it as a blacklist.

Mr. BAILEY. If the language is carefully read and considered, it does just that.

Mr. YORTY. It is a criminal statute. A felony is a very serious crime and I think a person should be guilty of it individually and they themselves, at least, ought to assert the right to strike, and not be held guilty of a felony because they happen to belong to an organization which asserted the right.

Some of our large labor organizations, and I think we will all agree that they are legitimate, as a matter of policy do not believe in striking against the Government, but they do assert that they have the right. The Government is going into all kinds of private enterprise and these union members who are engaged as workers in those enterprises will be made, by this criminal statute, guilty of a felony. If you want that kind of a statute it ought to go to the Committee on the Judiciary and be carefully drawn. I do not think it ought to be put in in an appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. I might state to the gentleman the reason why this provision has been carried in the bill for some time. I have served on the Committee on Appropriations for a number of years now. Many times we do not wish to write legislation, but where there is no other provision taking care of the situation in most instances the appropriate legislative committee is pleased to have it provided in this way, pending the time when they take action. In the instant case if the gentleman presses his point of order, there is nothing we can do but concede that the point of order is well taken. In doing that, may I point out to the gentleman that for the time being at least you are turning this thing loose without any way of your or my knowing when the Committee on the Judiciary will act or can act or how long it will take. Under present conditions, with the Russian situation being what it is, and with what the investigating committees are showing every day, far be it from me to believe that I can lecture the gentleman, but I would like to point out to the

gentleman that he is assuming a risk which I think is greater than many people would like to assume, because this would be turning the whole thing loose.

Mr. YORTY. If the gentleman will permit me I will say that so far as fighting communism in the United States is concerned, I yield to no one. I was the first chairman of an official state committee that was ever appointed in the United States to investigate Communists. My first big fight was with the so-called State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, which I said was a Communist organization in 1939, and which the national CIO threw out last year. Therefore, that question is not involved.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to say to the gentleman, I have not in the least intimated that the gentleman is in sympathy with these people. In fact his statement now just makes my wonderment a little stronger at his present action. If he presses his point of order, of course we will have to accept it.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order has been made to the language on page 23, line 11, as follows: "who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States." Does the gentleman press his point of order?

Mr. YORTY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, is the point of order against the one provision, or is the point of order made against the entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order raised by the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY] is against that one provision only.

Mr. CANNON. Then Mr. Chairman, I make a further point of order against the entire paragraph.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard with respect to the point made by the gentleman from Missouri?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished Chairman will permit me, I think he is making a mistake in striking all of the language.

I did not refer to the language that had to do with membership in an organization that would overthrow the Government, because that is covered in the Smith Act, and is still the law. I was only referring to that part, and raised my point of order only to that part which made a man guilty of a felony for belonging to an organization that merely asserted the right to strike against the Government.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the matter is all in one proposition. If we have to consider it at all we will have to consider it as one proposition. I make a point of order against the entire paragraph.

Mr. YORTY. I am making my point only against the part of the section which I read. If the gentleman wishes

to raise the point against the entire section that is his responsibility, not mine.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DELANEY). The gentleman from Missouri makes a point of order against the section beginning on line 16, page 22, and ending in line 6, page 24, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair must sustain the point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 1302. This act may be cited as the "Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951."

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, at the conclusion of the passage of the Davis amendment I was on my feet at that time for the purpose of offering an amendment relating to lines 9 through 18 on page 17, chapter IX of the bill. The Chair did not recognize me. I ask unanimous consent to return to that portion of the bill for the purpose of allowing me to offer my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we have passed that part of the bill, and proposal to return at this time must be objected to. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Committee will now return to page 14, line 4, which the Clerk will read.

Mr. THOMAS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, in order to save time, may I inquire of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] if he will withdraw his point of order?

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed the point of order with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART], the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I am advised that if the point of order is sustained, it is contended that it will throw out the first paragraph of the section, and possibly upset meritorious plans. I do not wish to be unduly technical, although I very much deplore this approach to a serious legislative problem. However, I think the matter will receive further consideration in another body, and I hope that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will give consideration to the legislative policies involved.

Having those points in mind, I have decided to withdraw the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the three pages mentioned be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. HART. I would like to state that I concur in the action taken by the gentleman from Maine, not only for the reasons that he has stated but on the assurance of the gentleman from Texas

[Mr. THOMAS] that the wording of the amendment is the product of Admiral Cochrane, Chairman of the Maritime Administration, in whom I have the greatest confidence.

Mr. THOMAS. I give the gentleman that assurance.

Mr. HART. I hope that in the future the departmental heads will not seek to transfer jurisdiction from one committee to another.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] give the House assurance that his committee will give consideration to this whole problem at an early date?

Mr. HART. I will give that assurance to the House, as well as to the gentleman in person.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from Maine, as well as to the gentleman from Texas, with reference to the legislation in this appropriation bill that some of the greatest abuses and scandal in the giving away of the taxpayers' money during World War II grew out of the operations of the War Shipping Administration which was set up by Executive order of the President. And now the President, by Executive order, has set up the same sort of thing by the name of the National Shipping Authority and the legislation in this appropriation bill bypassed the hearings of the legislative committee and sets the stage for the same kind of spending abuses and scandal of the War Shipping Administration on which recoveries have never been made. So unless there is assurance that there is going to be something done in conference that will stop the abuses as to the expenditure of public money like that occurring in World War II, where the War Shipping Administration wasted and gave away hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, I shall have to insist on the point of order. Therefore, I ask the gentleman from Texas with reference to his position as to what will be done in conference to insure against the occurrence of the same abuses and scandal.

Mr. THOMAS. I am sorry, but I did not hear all of the gentleman's question; will he use the microphone?

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the gentleman from Texas with reference to legislation that it attempted to be written into this appropriation bill. The greatest abuses, scandal, and wasting of taxpayers' money during World War II grew out of operations of the War Shipping Administration created by Executive order of the President, in which the Chairman of the Maritime Commission and the Chairman of the War Shipping Administration were one and the same person, and now the same vehicle is again created by the President under the name of the National Shipping Authority. The legislative part of this bill provides the same sort of authority and opens the door for the same kind of abuses and scandal.

I want to know whether this is going to be corrected in conference, because I shall make the point of order unless we

get assurance that there will not be a repetition of the shipping abuses and scandals that occurred in World War II by the operations of the War Shipping Administration and the Maritime Commission. With reference to the abuses, wasting of money, and scandals as to maritime insurance, operation of ships, chartering of ships, building of ships, the scandals of general agency, chartering, and the scandals of subsidized lines, where the Maritime Commission or War Shipping Administration did not take over the ships even when the Government paid one-half of the construction. That all arose from the loose legislation of the type now attempted in this appropriation bill, yet here it is again being sought to give the same authority without hearing on the previous scandals, without correction of the previous abuses, and with no authority of the legislative committee. There has been ample opportunity since June 24, 1950, to have legislation through the proper legislative committees holding hearings thereon as to abuses and scandals of previous operations so that they might be corrected in this new venture of the Maritime Administration and National Shipping Authority.

Yet the head of the Maritime Administration comes in with secret hearings before the Appropriations Committee, and the legislative committee knew nothing of this subterfuge until the hearings of the Appropriations Committee became available to the Members of the House when this bill was called for debate on the floor of the House. Does the gentleman from Texas assure this House that in conference something will be done so that authority for these abuses will not be slipped into the conference report? Because if this will not be done, I shall have to renew the point of order. The matters contained in this appropriation bill are strictly of legislation and should be considered before the Merchant Marine Committee.

Mr. THOMAS. I am glad to hear the gentleman from Ohio point out some of the defects. He has served on that very able and distinguished committee for a good many years; he served as its chairman for some years. I want to commend him for the good work that he and his committee have done. But you know this little subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has labored long and hard for some 4 or 5 years in an effort to straighten out the good old Maritime Commission, particularly in view of those fat subsidies they have been paying to the Club 13 and a good many other abuses. The gentleman well knows that they have had a considerable housecleaning in the Maritime Commission. In my humble judgment I doubt if there is a finer administrator in the Government service or that there has been a finer one since I have been here than Vice Adm. Ned Cochran. I think he will do a good job, and I will give the gentleman from Ohio my assurance, and I think the other members of the subcommittee will join me in this statement, that we will watch this fund and anything that gets out of line we will certainly bring to the gentleman's attention, and we will invite him to sit

in with us and help us in every way, because we really need his help. The Maritime Commission does also because it has been doing a rather vast business for the last 20 years. I do not have to tell the gentleman that, do I?

Mr. WEICHEL. The gentleman from Texas has always been most helpful. All I can say is that while there may be a new executive at the top, the same old crowd is down at the bottom. I am glad to have the gentleman's assurance.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, further reading of the section will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very shortly going to introduce a motion to recommit this bill with instructions to report the same back forthwith deleting lines 9 to 18 on page 17 of the bill. I do so because pursuant to the treaty with Canada for the development of Niagara power it was specifically stated in the treaty that the Federal Government would not expend any money for the development of power until authorized by Congress.

Now, as a matter of fact, I have before this House a bill, which has been referred to the Committee on Public Works, for the development of power in the Niagara River by private enterprise. Very shortly, it is my understanding that the State of New York will introduce a bill, or there will be introduced a bill, for the development of power in the Niagara River in the State of New York. There is presently before the Committee on Public Works of the House a bill introduced by a gentleman of this House for development by the Federal Government of power in the Niagara River.

Mr. Chairman, the \$450,000 provided in this particular provision of the pending bill is not for remedial work; it is for the development of power, and it so states, and for the investigation of the possibility of the development of power projects in the Niagara River. That part of the river happens to be in my congressional district, and in my congressional district we still believe there is no substitute for the ingenuity of freemen working under a system of free enterprise for the development of power any more than for the manufacture of automobiles. We believe at a time like this, when all of the money in America is needed for defense and defense purposes, there should not be allocated a half million dollars for investigation of power possibilities by the Federal Government through an appropriation bill, but that it should be done after a study by the Committee on Public Works on how best for all the people of America can be developed the power in the Niagara River.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman know that the people in the State of New York in 1949 paid \$293,000,000 more for their electricity than they would have had to pay right across the line in Ontario?

Mr. MILLER of New York. That is only because of the fact that the private project within the State of New York paid that much difference in taxes to the Government, and it relieved the taxes on the real estate within my congressional district and the other sections of New York. As a matter of fact, across the river in Canada the power rates would be greater if you consider the fact they did not receive Government subsidies.

Mr. RANKIN. Why, you paid that much more than you would have paid in Tacoma, Wash., where they paid more taxes in proportion than the Power Trust pays in New York.

Mr. MILLER of New York. The facts I have cited do not indicate that is so.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I can cite the gentleman the figures.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman know that on the basis of the testimony given to the Committee on Appropriations two-thirds of the water flowing down the Niagara River at the present time is flowing on the Canadian side of the border and that the purpose of this investigation is to determine the best method to get more of the water back to the American side? If the gentleman's contention be correct it will mean that a natural resource is going more and more to the country on the north and that the private power companies for whom he speaks may very well be out of business in a relatively short time.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Does the gentleman know that section within this bill states that the purpose is the development and utilization of power? Does the gentleman also know that private enterprise in the State of New York has made previous studies of this proposition and are ready to go to work and develop the power with private capital without taxpayers' money if they are given the opportunity to do so?

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman know that as a result of this study it may very well be that the private power companies may be in a much better position to take advantage of the water resources of the Niagara River?

Mr. MILLER of New York. The old story will prevail, when the Federal Government spends a half million dollars in there they will want to continue.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The testimony before our committee on this project was to the effect that the Mohawk Power Co. was ready, able, and willing to put up every dollar necessary to develop that power if given the opportunity to do so.

Mr. MILLER of New York. That is my understanding and I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of stating that very shortly we will have before us the so-called Heselton amendment. In my

opinion, the Heselton amendment is too severe. Instead of the \$750,000 cut proposed, a reduction of \$300,000 could be made without harm. Let us look at it from a realistic point of view. When this particular amendment goes over to the Senate, and there then follows a conference between the House and the Senate, I believe we will have about the right figure in the bill as far as the Commodity Credit Corporation limitation is concerned.

I personally do not think that any governmental activity is so sacred that it is untouchable as far as economy is concerned. When we realize that the Commodity Credit Corporation is here allotted an additional \$2,000,000, making nearly \$20,000,000 available for administrative expenses, certainly a saving of 3 percent of that large sum could be effected without in any sense harming its operations. I have too often fought for Commodity Credit on this floor to be willing to see anything done to hurt it or prevent it from continuing to do a splendid job. Nevertheless, we must save a little here and there, even at the expense of activities we favor most. For that reason, knowing that this proposed cut will not harm Commodity Credit, and also knowing that it is our duty here to hold down expenses as far as is consistent with good operation, I intend to vote "aye" on the Heselton amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I was certainly amused, or probably I should say amazed, at the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER] attacking this item for the investigation of power possibilities on the United States side of the Niagara River.

As I have pointed out time and time again, the power business is a public business. Electricity has become a necessity of our modern life, and it must be handled by a monopoly. If a half dozen concerns attempted to supply electricity to the same city, town, or community, the overhead costs would be so great the people could not bear them. Any monopoly of a necessity of life is a public business. Besides the water power already belongs to the Federal Government. That was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in both the Ashwander case and Appalachian Power case.

The statements being made on this floor, and elsewhere, to the effect that public power is communistic are simply stupid.

One of the greatest public-power systems in the world is that of the Ontario Power Commission, which is just across the line from the State of New York. As I pointed out a moment ago, if the people of New York had got their power at the same rate as do the people of Ontario, they would have saved \$293,000,000 on their light and power bills alone during the year 1949.

I know it is charged that the Ontario Commission pays no taxes. That charge cannot be made against the city of Tacoma, in the State of Washington, which has one of the finest public power systems in the United States. If the people of the State of New York had got their power in 1949 at the Tacoma rates, they

would have saved \$321,000,000 on their light and power bills alone; and I dare say, that the Tacoma light and power system pays more in lieu of taxes, in proportion to the amount invested, than do the private power companies in the State of New York.

Large numbers of cities and towns in New York have public power systems. Take the city of Watertown, the county seat of Jefferson County, with a population of approximately 40,000 people. Watertown has had a public power systems for more than 20 years. Jamestown, Plattsburg, Rockville, and a large number of other thriving cities in that State have public power systems. Many of them are free from debt and have the lowest power rates to be found in the State. Would anybody be so stupid as to call the people of those places Communists?

A large portion of the power used in Ontario is generated at Niagara Falls. Windsor, Canada, which is 258 miles from Niagara Falls, gets its power from that place through the Ontario Power Commission. Windsor is just across the line from Detroit, Mich. If the people of the State of Michigan got their power at the same rates the people get in Windsor, during the year 1949 they would have saved \$117,543,042 on their electric light and power bills alone.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Does the gentleman in his State have a public power commission, or any other regulatory body for the regulation of power rates?

Mr. RANKIN. No; but we have a yardstick, which is much better.

As the gentleman perhaps knows, I was coauthor for creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. MILLER of New York. I will concede that.

Mr. RANKIN. The Tennessee Valley Authority has wrought the greatest development of ancient or modern times, and has given the American people a yardstick to show what electricity is worth. It has saved the electric light and power consumers of America billions of dollars in the last 18 years, and has stimulated the use of electricity as nothing else has ever done since Edison invented the electric light, the incandescent lamp, and ushered in the electric age.

Senator Norris and I gave the TVA the power to fix the maximum retail rates to be charged for electricity generated by the Authority and distributed throughout the distribution radius, which was admitted to be 350 miles in every direction. I never stopped until I got TVA power into every city, every town, and every community in the district I represent. When I started in that fight, less than 1 percent of the people living in the rural districts in that area had electricity in their homes. Today, between 90 and 95 percent of them have electricity in their homes, and they are using it for all purposes—lights, radios, water pumps, washing machines, refrigerators, electric stoves, milking machines, feed grinders, hay dryers,

deep freezers, and all other electrical appliances they are able to afford. It has done more to relieve the drudgery and raise their standards of living than anything else that has ever been provided; and that applies to the farm homes throughout the entire United States.

When the TVA was created, less than 10 percent of the farms in America were electrified. On June 30, 1950, 86.3 percent of the farms throughout this country had electricity, and it is my hope that within a short time we will have reached every farm home in America with a power line, and that we can provide them with electricity at the lowest possible rates.

That never would have been done if we had depended on the private-power interests.

I have led the fight in the House for rural electrification and for the development of our water power for the last 18 years. If it had not been for that fight, I dare say the average farmer would not have seen electric lights in his home for the next 50 years, and when he did see it the chances are the rates would have been so high that he could not pay them. Our fight has not only carried electricity to the farmers' homes but it has held their rates down.

The year I came to Congress the people throughout the whole United States used only 37,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. Last year, 1950, they used 329,000,000,000, or approximately 10 times as much as they used the year I came here. That is due to the fact that we brought the rates down, developed water power throughout the Nation, and extended power lines to the farm homes in every State in the Union.

Even in the State of New York they have made wonderful progress. In 1934, the year that Senator Norris and I took up the fight for rural electrification, 32.7 percent of the farms in New York were electrified. On June 30, 1950, 95.7 percent of the farm homes in New York had electricity, and I dare say by this time it has reached 98 or 99 percent—or more than three times what it was in 1934; and the use of electricity in the towns and cities, as I have pointed out, has grown by leaps and bounds until today we are using approximately 10 times as much as we used the year I came to Congress. That is due largely to these public power facilities, headed by the TVA; and I might add that the Ontario Power Commission, by its marvelous example, has aided in bringing down the rates in the Northeastern States just as the Columbia River, the Colorado River, and the Tennessee River have done in the South and West.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Does the gentleman think the country is better off now than when the gentleman first came to Congress?

Mr. RANKIN. Why certainly. I have just pointed out the great advances that have been made in the use of electric lights and power, which also means in the manufacture, sale, and use of electrical appliances, from the electric light to the refrigerator, the electric stove, the washing machine, the attic fan, the milking machine, the deep freeze, and

all the rest of those appliances that go to relieve the drudgery, add to the prosperity, and brighten the homes of the average American family.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Does the gentleman believe that is true to all the fields of private enterprise?

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I will say to the gentleman from New York that every business in America has been stimulated by this vast improvement and increase in electric power. As I pointed out a moment ago, we used 329,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours last year, as against 37,000,000,000 in 1921. We still have 394,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries every year. If this were developed and firmed up to the peak of an average year, it would increase our use of electric power to almost a trillion kilowatt-hours a year and make this the richest and the most prosperous country of which the world has ever dreamed.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the Record, I want to reply to the silly statement made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] in which he brands public power as communistic.

As every informed Member of this House knows, no man has fought communism harder, or done more to expose the Reds, the enemies within our gates, and to drive them from positions of power and influence than I have. But for the gentleman from Arkansas, or anybody else, to contend that public power is communistic is so puerile that it ought not to require an answer. But since he has used my name in connection therewith, merely repeating the power trust propaganda, I want to show the House and the country the silliness of such an argument. In the first place, I have shown that Ontario has a public power system and that the people of Ontario, instead of being communistic, or Communist-inclined, are among the most conservative people in the world. I have pointed out that large numbers of the finest towns and cities in the State of New York have public power systems and some of them have had these for more than 50 years.

Turn to other States, such as Ohio, whose capital, Columbus, has had a public power system for more than 60 years; Cleveland, the largest city in Ohio, has had a public power system for 35 years.

Turn to the State of Michigan, you will find that Lansing, the capital of that great commonwealth, has a public power system and has had for almost 60 years. The same thing applies to the cities of Kalamazoo, Marquette, Niles, Bay City, Allegan, and a large number of other leading towns and cities in that State.

Take the State of Illinois, and you will find that Springfield, the capital of that great commonwealth, the home of Abraham Lincoln, has had a public power system for the last 55 years, as have a vast number of other towns and cities in that State.

Then glance at the State of Kentucky and you will see that Frankfort, the capital of the Blue Grass State, has a

public power system, as have other cities and municipalities throughout the commonwealth.

The same thing applies to the city of Austin, the capital of the great State of Texas, which has had a public power system for almost 50 years.

Nashville, the capital of Tennessee; Lincoln, the capital of Nebraska; Tallahassee, the capital of Florida; Sacramento, the capital of California, and a vast number of other cities in every State in this Union, have public power systems, which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] calls "communistic."

If we had waited for the private power interests to develop the water power of this Nation and to electrify every city, town, and community, the chances are that the American people would not be using one-tenth the electricity that they are using today; and practically every farm home in America would be in the dark.

In 1934, when Senator Norris and I began the drive for rural electrification, only 1.2 percent of the farm homes in Arkansas had electricity. On June 30, 1950, 82.6 percent of the farms in Arkansas were electrified. That increase is due to the public development through the Rural Electrification Administration.

If the Power Trust should get a monopoly, as it is trying to do, on the production and distribution of electricity in this country, those rates would rise by leaps and bounds to where the average householder, and especially the average farmer, would be so penalized by exorbitant rates for his electric lights and power that he could not possibly use the electric facilities which he and his family are enjoying today.

I repeat that the power business is a public business. If it had not been for the development of the water power of this Nation, and its distribution through public-power facilities, we would be far behind the rest of the world today.

In 1936, when the International Power Conference met in Washington, this country had only about 10 or 12 percent of its farms electrified, while Japan had 90 percent of its farms electrified; Germany had 90 percent; France and Italy had 94 percent; and even New Zealand, a new and sparsely settled country, had 65 percent of her farms electrified. Today, as a result of the public-power development in this country, we have almost 90 percent of our farm homes in this country electrified, the use of electricity has increased by leaps and bounds, and the rank and file of the American people are enjoying a standard of living of which they scarcely dreamed a generation ago.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible for any person to justify the federalization of electric power or any other segment of our free enterprise system upon its own merits; therefore the electric power federalizers attempt to use the good name of the meritorious rural electrification cooperatives to enhance their ulterior motives and assist their socialistic scheme.

The rural electrification program was founded and has existed upon a democratic basis, logical principles, and American philosophy. It is not a nationalized program, and has no kinship to federally owned and dominated industry. Oh, yes, some are making desperate efforts to remove controls of these justifiable benefits from the farmers and turn the operations over to the Federal Government. That must not happen. Those who would nationalize the electric industry want it to be generally thought that the successful REA program is federally owned and controlled; and it is a part of their program to nationalize the REA co-ops along with other electric industry.

The REA program is a justifiable necessity. Private enterprise either could not or would not bring electricity to the sparsely settled rural areas of this country. It has proved to be a wondrous improvement to our rural areas.

However, there are a few people in this country who will tell you that there is a Communist behind every bush, and in the very next breath advocate everything that the Communists stand for.

Talk about overcharge for electricity to people of Michigan and New York. If you are describing the savings to electricity consumers upon the basis of how cheap the Government can produce electricity where the Government has no taxes to pay, no accountability to stockholders, and is subsidized for all operational losses, of course the Government can produce electricity cheaper than private enterprise can produce it. But I am at a loss to know where you are going to get the money to operate this Government when you put the taxpaying enterprises out of business as Russia has done. Those hollering here the loudest and longest that Communists are just taking over this country then stand here each and every day in this Congress advocating liberalistic ideas that even Joe Stalin would turn his nose up at.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman think the people of Ontario are Communists?

They are really about the most conservative people in America; and they have one of the finest public power systems in the world. If all the people of this country got their electricity at the Ontario rates they would save more than \$2,000,000,000 a year on their light and power bills.

It would take a thousand bales of cotton for every county in Arkansas to pay the overcharges for electricity paid by the people of that State every year.

The figures I am using are correct. They are compiled by the finest experts in America and are thoroughly reliable.

Mr. TACKETT. I do not know what the people of Ontario are, but if I would listen to the gentleman from Mississippi I would think that everybody in this country besides him was a Communist.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman know that the people of the State of Arkansas are overcharged 100 percent for their electricity?

The statement of the gentleman from Arkansas to the effect that public power is communistic is about the silliest, if not the most stupid, argument I have ever heard.

The power business is a public business. Electricity has become a necessity of our modern life. It must be handled by a monopoly. Any monopoly of a necessity is a public business. Besides, the water power of the Nation already belongs to the Federal Government—as the Supreme Court has decided time and again. If it had not been for our public power program the average farmer in this country would not have seen an electric light in his house for the next 50 years.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman says that the people in Arkansas are overcharged 100 percent, I believe he says, for electricity. In that same pamphlet he has in his hand, which he has been putting in the Record for years and years and years, he tells about the overcharge in Tennessee, when there is not one private electric company in Tennessee. Where can he get those figures? Nobody knows. There is not one logical reason or any basic foundation for a single, solitary figure that the gentleman has been putting in the Record since I was a child.

While the gentleman from Mississippi daily denounces communism in name he strongly advocates all of the economic principles of communism. To advocate such principles it is necessary to fight communism in order to get along with our people.

Show me one thing that is American about this federalization of power, federalization of all monopolies. All of us frown upon monopolies. There is no question in any of our minds about that. But I would rather see little monopolies controlled by the municipalities, controlled by the States, and controlled by the Federal Government, than to see one great octopus monopoly, Nation-wide in scope, a Federal monopoly controlled by the Federal Government.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Last year before our committee came the chairman of the New York Power Authority. I asked him if he thought he could generate power cheaper than private industry could do it if you relieved private industry of taxes, and his answer was "We could not do it."

Mr. TACKETT. Certainly they could not do it, but it is a saving, so says the gentleman from Mississippi, if you pay one penny more than the Government can produce it at, when they have no taxes to pay and they have no stockholders to account to, and they are subsidized for all losses. That is savings.

Yes, I will assure you that the Government can sell groceries a lot cheaper than private enterprise can sell them. I can assure you that the Government can sell clothing a lot cheaper than private enterprise. But I am telling you good people one thing, you can stand up here and holler for this two-bit welfare idea on the theory as advanced by the

gentleman from Mississippi and it will not be long before you are not going to have any democracy left.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, without resolving this question which has arisen here, I would like to call your attention again to the fact that at the conclusion of the consideration of this bill by the committee, and when we are in the House I expect to ask for a vote on the so-called Commodity Credit amendment. In doing that I think we ought to be given an opportunity to correct what I believe to have been a mistake when the committee accepted the amendment yesterday. We have these commodities. We have this volume of business. We have these contracts in excess of 300,000 in grain alone where we have the bookkeeping work and we are trying to arrive at how much storage and how much transportation and how much of everything goes into each contract. On April 30 we will have additional numbers of such things. The work has to be done and these accounts have to be worked out and the settlement gotten to the farmers throughout the Nation. If this cut stands, these settlements are going to be delayed and we are going to risk losing additional money by the Commodity Credit Corporation. You are going to be very busy making explanations to the farmers of the Nation and there is no occasion for it because you do not save money by this amendment. I heard my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, in his statement just now when he said that he hoped to resolve these differences, by accepting this amendment and splitting the difference with the Senate. I would not say you cannot make some explanation for a vote in favor of this cut, but I do say that the explanation is liable to end up being taken as an excuse. It is the same situation as existed with the Commodity Credit Corporation a few years ago when my Republican friends prohibited them from providing warehouses. Many farmers were precluded from coming under the loan program of the Commodity Credit Corporation and they took the explanation as an excuse. This work has to be done and the money has to be provided, and the people, too, so that they can get through with this backlog by July 1, or we will have to carry it over into the new year at additional cost.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Mississippi knows very well that the gentleman from Minnesota does not need any excuses to vote for some economy in Government. After all the gentleman certainly will admit that if we in agriculture want to cut every other division of Government, certainly we ought to get down to some safe and sane point in agriculture as well.

Mr. WHITTEN. I agree with the gentleman. I will say that I am sure he sincerely believes he has a sound explanation of his position. I am afraid

others might think it an excuse. I do not believe the gentleman offered an amendment in committee which was not adopted and which amendments were for the purpose of reducing any amount.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman will recall my observation on this point was that \$2,500,000 should be sufficient.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Also certainly the other three members of our subcommittee will agree that I reserved in subcommittee every right to do as I see fit on the floor. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

The gentleman is certainly right. There is nobody here whom I hold in higher regard than I do the gentleman. He reserved all rights. He may be right about this, but I think he is wrong. What I am trying to say is that the explanation he offers is liable to be accepted as an excuse instead of an explanation in the minds of the farmers and the people who are going to be affected by this, if he should be wrong in his judgment. The Republican leadership had that so-called explanation on the action of restricting warehousing, but the people thought it was an excuse, and found out, to their minds, at least, it was something to their detriment. I am again telling you you are making the same kind of mistake if you keep this amendment in this bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3587) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Commodity Credit Corporation amendment on page 11.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 11, line 23, after the word "to", strike out "\$19,100,000" and insert "\$18,350,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 159, nays 250, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—159

Adair	Ellsworth	Mumma
Allen, Calif.	Elston	Nelson
Allen, Ill.	Fellows	Nicholson
Andersen	Fenton	Norblad
H. Carl	Ford	O'Hara
Anderson, Calif.	Fulton	Ostertag
Andersen	Gamble	Patterson
August H.	Gavin	Phillips
Angell	Golden	Potter
Arends	Goodwin	Poulson
Auchincloss	Graham	Prouty
Ayres	Gwinn	Radwan
Baker	Hale	Reece, Tenn.
Bakewell	Hall	Reed, Ill.
Bates, Mass.	Edwin Arthur	Reed, N. Y.
Beall	Hall	Rees, Kans.
Beamer	Leonard W.	Ribicoff
Belcher	Halleck	Riehlman
Bender	Hand	Rogers, Mass.
Bennett, Mich.	Harden	Sadlak
Betts	Harrison, Wyo.	St. George
Bishop	Herter	Saylor
Blackney	Heselton	Schwabe
Boggs, Del.	Hess	Scott, Hardie
Bolton	Hillings	Scott
Bow	Hinsshaw	Hugh D., Jr.
Bray	Hoffman, Ill.	Scudder
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Mich.	Seely-Brown
Brownson	Jackson, Calif.	Shafer
Buffett	James	Sheehan
Busbey	Javits	Simpson, Ill.
Bush	Jenison	Simpson, Pa.
Butler	Jenkins	Sittler
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Smith, Wis.
Case	Jonas	Springer
Chenoweth	Kean	Stefan
Chiperfield	Kearney	Taber
Church	Kearns	Taylor
Clevenger	Keating	Thompson,
Cole, N. Y.	Kersten, Wis.	Mich.
Corbett	Kilburn	Towe
Cotton	Latham	Vall
Coudert	Lucas	Van Pelt
Crawford	McConnell	Van Zandt
Crumpacker	McCulloch	Vaughn
Curtis, Mo.	McDonough	Velde
Curtis, Nebr.	McGregor	Vorys
Dague	McVey	Vursell
Davis, Wis.	Martin, Mass.	Weichel
Denny	Mason	Wharton
Devereux	Meador	Widnall
D'Ewart	Morrow	Wigglesworth
Dondero	Miller, Nebr.	Williams, N. Y.
Donovan	Miller, N. Y.	Wolverton
Eaton	Morano	Wood, Idaho

NAYS—250

Aandahl	Canfield	Felghan
Abbitt	Cannon	Fernandez
Abernethy	Carlisle	Fisher
Addonizio	Carnahan	Flood
Albert	Chatham	Fogarty
Andrews	Chelf	Forand
Anfuso	Chudoff	Forrester
Aspinall	Clemente	Fugate
Bailey	Cole, Kans.	Furcolo
Barden	Colmer	Garmatz
Baring	Combs	Gary
Barrett	Cooley	Gathings
Bates, Ky.	Cooper	George
Battle	Cox	Gordon
Beckworth	Crosser	Gore
Bennett, Fla.	Cunningham	Gossett
Bentsen	Davis, Ga.	Granahan
Berry	Davis, Tenn.	Granger
Blatnik	Dawson	Grant
Boggs, La.	Deane	Green
Bolling	DeGraffenried	Greenwood
Bonner	Delaney	Gregory
Bosone	Dempsey	Gross
Bramblett	Denton	Hagen
Breen	Dollinger	Hardy
Brooks	Dolliver	Harris
Brown, Ga.	Donohue	Harrison, Va.
Bryson	Doughton	Hart
Budge	Doyle	Harvey
Burdick	Durham	Havener
Burleson	Eberhart	Hays, Ark.
Burnside	Elliott	Hays, Ohio
Burton	Engle	Hébert
Byrne, N. Y.	Evins	Hedrick
Camp	Fallon	Heffernan

Heller	Machrowicz	Rodino
Herlong	Mack, Ill.	Rogers, Colo.
Hill	Mack, Wash.	Rogers, Fla.
Hoeven	Madden	Rogers, Tex.
Holfield	Magee	Rooney
Holmes	Mahon	Roosevelt
Hope	Mansfield	Sabath
Horan	Marshall	Sasser
Howell	Martin, Iowa	Schriver
Hull	Miller, Calif.	Shelley
Hunter	Mills	Sheppard
Irving	Mitchell	Short
Jackson, Wash.	Morgan	Sikes
Jarman	Morris	Smith, Kans.
Johnson	Morrison	Smith, Miss.
Jones, Ala.	Moulder	Spence
Jones, Mo.	Multer	Staggers
Jones	Murdoch	Stanley
Hamilton C.	Murphy	Steed
Jones	Murray, Tenn.	Stigler
Woodrow W.	Norrell	Stockman
Karsten, Mo.	O'Brien, Ill.	Sutton
Kee	O'Brien, Mich.	Tackett
Kelley, Pa.	O'Neill	Talle
Kelly, N. Y.	O'Toole	Teague
Kennedy	Passman	Thomas
Keogh	Patman	Thompson, Tex.
Kerr	Patten	Thornberry
Kilday	Perkins	Trimble
King	Philbin	Vinson
Kirwan	Pickett	Walter
Klein	Poage	Welch
Kluczynski	Polk	Werdel
Lane	Powell	Wheeler
Lanham	Preston	Whitaker
Lantaff	Price	Whitten
Larcade	Priest	Wickersham
LeCompte	Quinn	Wier
Lesinski	Rabaut	Williams, Miss.
Lind	Rains	Willis
Lovre	Ramsay	Wilson, Ind.
Lyle	Rankin	Wilson, Tex.
McCarthy	Redden	Winstead
McCormack	Regan	Withrow
McGrath	Richards	Wolcott
McGuire	Riley	Wood, Ga.
McKinnon	Rivers	Yates
McMillan	Roberts	Yorty
McMullen	Robeson	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—24

Allen, La.	Dorn	O'Konski
Armstrong	Fine	Reams
Boykin	Frazier	Rhodes
Brehm	Gillette	Secrest
Buchanan	Judd	Sieminski
Buckley	Miller, Md.	Smith, Va.
Celler	Morton	Tollefson
Dingell	Murray, Wis.	Woodruff

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Smith of Virginia against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Celler against.
Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Fine with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. AANDAH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, during one roll call I was in the radio gallery recording a broadcast to my district in Minnesota. I did not know of the roll call and therefore was not in the Chamber and regret that I cannot qualify.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MILLER of New York. Yes, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. Does any gentleman who is opposed to the bill without qualification desire to offer a motion to recommit the bill? If not, I assume the gentleman from New York qualifies by a bare margin.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER of New York moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 17, strike out lines 9 to 18, inclusive.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

1951 AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, S. 1, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Friday, April 6, 1951, general debate had been concluded on the bill. Under House Resolution 171, the committee substitute will be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk will now read the committee substitute for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (a) of section 1 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) This act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Training and Service Act.'"

(b) The first two sentences of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 18 years and 6 months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or for training in the National Security Training Corps: *Provided*, That any such person who has not attained the age of 18 years and 6 months shall, as soon as practicable following his registration, be classified and examined physically and mentally in order to determine his availability for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps, upon his attaining the age of 18 years and 6 months. Any citizen of a foreign country, who has not declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States and who is not deferrable or exempt from training and service under the provisions of this title (other than this subsection), shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this title if, prior to his induction into the Armed Forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any person who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States."

(c) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is hereby amended to read: "The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title or for training in the National Security Training Corps as hereafter provided (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or age groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the strength of the Armed Forces and to further the purposes of this act."

(d) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is amended to read as follows: "No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service or for training in the National Security Training Corps under this title until his acceptability in all respects, including his physical and mental fitness, has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided*, That the minimum standards for physical and mental acceptability established pursuant to this subsection shall not be higher than those applied to persons inducted between the ages of 18 and 26 in January 1945."

(e) Paragraph 4 of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Every person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall following his induction be given full and adequate military training for service in the armed force into which he is inducted for a period of not less than 4 months, and no person inducted into the Armed Forces shall, during this 4 months' period, be assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions (including the Canal Zone); and no person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall, during the 6-month period immediately following his induction, be assigned for duty in a combat area on land located outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone)."

(f) Subsection (b) of section 4 of said act is amended to read as follows: "(b) Each person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service for a period of 26 consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 of this title."

(g) Subsection (c) of section 4 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Any enlisted member of any reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided*, That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further*, That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such reserve component: *And provided further*, That any person who was a member of a reserve component on June 25, 1950, and who thereafter continued to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component, shall, if his application for active duty made pursuant to this paragraph is denied, be deferred from induction under this title until such time as he is ordered to active duty or ceases to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component."

"(2) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person, between the ages of 18 and 26, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for such training and service so long as he is deferred after classification."

"(3) At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title, any person, after attaining the age of 18, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title."

"(4) Any person after attaining the age of 17 shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b)."

"(5) At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title any person after attaining the age of 17 shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title."

(h) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Each person who, subsequent to June 25, 1950, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth, shall be required to serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces or in training in the National Security Training Corps, and in a reserve component for a total period of 6 years, unless sooner discharged on the grounds of personal hardship, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and

service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue personal hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from training and service in the Armed Forces prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force."

(i) Subsection (g) and (h) of section 4 are repealed.

(j) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of such act is amended by striking out the word "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-six."

(k) Section 4 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all Armed Forces, and uniform in its applications to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for (A) decreasing periods of service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (B) eliminating periods of service required under this title.

"(2) Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—

"(A) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than 26 months which may be designated in such resolution; or

"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated,

the period of active service of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so decreased or eliminated, as the case may be. Whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter liable for induction under section 4 of this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth

anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security Training Corps as hereinafter established for initial military training for a period of 6 months: *Provided*, That persons deferred under the provisions of section 6 of this title shall not be relieved from liability for induction into the National Security Training Corps solely by reason of having exceeded the age of 19 years during the period of such deferment.

"(3) There is hereby established a National Security Training Commission (hereinafter called the Commission), which shall be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians; of the remaining two members one shall be an active or retired member of a regular component of the Armed Forces, the other shall be a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces or a person entitled to retired or retirement pay because of his service as a member of a reserve component. Members of the Commission shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among persons of outstanding national reputation. The President shall select the Chairman of the Commission from among its civilian members. No person who has been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a regular component of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for appointment as a civilian member of the Commission. The Commission shall have a seal which shall be judicially noted. At such time as the Commission shall be appointed, in accordance with this paragraph, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps.

"(4) The term of office of two of the members of the Commission shall be 2 years. The term of office of the remaining three members of the Commission shall be for 3, 4, and 5 years, respectively. Any individual appointed to fill a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a member, shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of such member. Members of the Commission, while actually serving with the Commission, shall receive a per diem of not to exceed \$50 for each day engaged in the business of the Commission and shall be allowed transportation and a per diem in lieu of subsistence of \$9 while away from their homes or places of business pursuant to such business.

"(5) The Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, direct and control the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training shall be basic military training. It shall establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial military training of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. The Commission shall make adequate provisions for the moral and spiritual welfare of members of the National Security Training Corps. Subject to the direction of the President, and after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Commission shall designate the military departments to carry out such training. Each military department so designated shall carry out such military training in accordance with the policies, standards, and directives of the Commission.

"(6) The Commission is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary to enable it to perform its functions.

"(7) The Commission shall prepare and submit to the Congress a plan or plans for—

"(i) a program of initial military training deemed by the Commission to be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act, which program shall include the types of basic military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps;

"(ii) measures for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of members of the National Security Training Corps;

"(iii) a code of conduct, together with penalties for violation thereof;

"(iv) such other policies and standards as may be established under the provisions of paragraph (5) of this subsection; and

"(v) recommendations with respect to disability and death benefits and other benefits, and the obligations, duties, liabilities, and responsibilities, to be granted or imposed upon members of the National Security Training Corps.

"(8) No person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until after—

"(1) the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the plan provided for in paragraph (7) of this subsection is transmitted to the Congress and referred to the Committees on Armed Services (during which 60-day period there has not been passed by either of the two Houses of the Congress, by the affirmative vote of a majority of either House, a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor such plan: *Provided*, That the Committees on Armed Services of both Houses to which the plan is referred shall, not later than the expiration of the first period of 45 calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the plan provided for in paragraph (7) of this subsection is transmitted to the Congress, report a resolution to their respective Houses approving or disapproving the plan submitted by the Commission, and its recommendations thereon, and such resolution shall be privileged and may be called up by any member of either House; and

"(2) the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(9) Following the adoption of a plan submitted by the Commission pursuant to paragraph (8), the Commission may, if changes to the plan are deemed desirable by the Commission, submit such changes to the Congress in accordance with the procedure prescribed in paragraph (8), and such changes shall be acted upon as prescribed in paragraph (8).

"(10) Six months following the commencement of induction of persons into the National Security Training Corps, and semiannually thereafter, the Commission shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive report describing in detail the operation of the National Security Training Corps, including the number of persons inducted therein, a list of camps and stations at which training is being conducted, a report on the number of deaths and injuries occurring during such training and the causes thereof, an estimate of the performance of the persons inducted therein, including an analysis of the disciplinary problems encountered during the preceding 6 months, the number of civilian employees of the Commission and the administrative costs of the Commission. Simultaneously, there shall be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Defense a report setting forth an estimate of the value of the training conducted during the preceding 6 months, the cost of the training program chargeable to the appropriations made to the Department of Defense, and the number of personnel of the Armed Forces directly engaged in the conduct of such training.

"(11) Each person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be compensated at the monthly rate of \$30: *Provided, however*, That each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such

terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E-1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 as may be extended or amended plus \$40 so long as such person has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed.

"(12) No person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be assigned for training at an installation located on land outside the continental United States, except that residents of Territories and possessions of the United States may be trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted."

(1) Subsection (a) of section 5 of said act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following words: "And provided further, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age group or groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President."

(m) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such act is amended by striking out "the effective date of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1951."

(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such act is amended by inserting after the words "six months" a comma and the words "prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its strength authorized by current appropriations, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction,".

(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such act is amended by inserting after "subsection (b)" a comma and the following: "paragraph (1) of this subsection,".

(n) Subsection (a) of section 6 of said act is amended by inserting the words "midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;" immediately following the words "cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy;".

(o) Subsection (d) of section 6 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, while undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), not less than 2 years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a regular or reserve component until the sixth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such

persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of military training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of military training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed 1 year.

"(2) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(p) Subsection (h) of section 6 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (f)) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status: *Provided further*, That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this act until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwise deferrable under any other provisions of this act. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone except in cases of extreme hardship) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively

to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they may maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board."

(q) Subsection (i) of section 6 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"(2) Any person who while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution is ordered to report for induction under this title, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of such academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier: *Provided*, That any person who has heretofore had his induction postponed under the provisions of section 6 (i) (2) of the Selective Service Act of 1948; or any person who has heretofore been deferred as a student under section 6 (h) of said act; or any person who hereafter is deferred under the provision of this subsection, shall not be further deferred by reason of pursuit of a course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution except as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the provisions of subsection (h) of this section. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(r) Section 7 of said act is hereby repealed.

(s) (1) Section 9 (b) (A) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".

(2) Section 9 (b) (B) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".

(3) Section 9 (b) (C) (i) is amended to read as follows: "If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise,

to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or".

(t) Subsection (g) of section 9 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a Reserve component) and who serves for not more than 4 years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title, if he is relieved from active duty not later than 4 years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such 4 years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes application for reinstatement within 30 days following his release, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."

(u) Subsection (a) of section 13 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof the words "or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board."

(v) Section 10 of said act is amended by (1) amending the sixth sentence of the proviso appearing in section 10 (b) (3) to read as follows: "There shall be not less than one appeal board located within the area of each Federal judicial district in the United States, and such additional separate panels thereof, as may be prescribed by the President,"; and

(2) By adding at the end of section 10 a new subsection as follows:

"(g) The Director of Selective Service shall submit to the Congress, on or before the 3d day of January of each year, a written report covering the operation of the Selective Service System and such report shall include, by States, information as to the number of persons registered under this act; the number of persons inducted into the military service under this act; and the number of deferments granted under this act and the basis for such deferments."

(w) Section 17 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws or any parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by the military departments designated by the Com-

mission shall be appropriated directly to the Department of Defense.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, the Congress may, by concurrent resolution, terminate or suspend for a stated period of time, all inductions into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person inducted into the National Security Training Corps prior to the adoption of said concurrent resolution shall, not more than 6 months following the adoption thereof, be released from training in such corps, but shall not be relieved from his obligation to serve in a reserve component as provided in section 4 (d) (3) of this title.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no person shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1954."

(x) Section 21 of such act is amended (1) by striking out "July 9, 1951," inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953," and (2) by adding the following at the end thereof: "Any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of 90 days or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive, or for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, inclusive, who is now or may hereafter be ordered to active duty pursuant to this section, shall upon the completion of 12 or more months of active duty since June 25, 1950, if he makes application therefor to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is serving, be released from active duty."

Mr. JAVITS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it appropriate at this time to offer an amendment which will follow line 11, which was just read by the Clerk?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not proper to offer amendment until section 1 of the bill has been read.

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of section 1, and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have an amendment which comes right after the enacting clause. Could the Chairman inform me when I should present it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not able to advise the gentleman when he should present his own amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill under consideration. Am I correct in believing that following the reading of the first section, which has just been completed, committee amendments are in order and take precedence over any amendment or substitute; and that following the completion of the consideration of committee amendments or amendments to committee amendments the substitute to which I refer is in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. It is in order to offer a substitute after the reading of the first section of the bill and after the committee amendments have been presented and considered.

Mr. BARDEN. I wish to apprise the Chair of the fact that that is my intention and that I have such a substitute and expect to offer it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it the intention of the Chair to rule, therefore, that the substitute will precede any other amendment except committee amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. No; that is not the intention of the Chair, because that is not in conformity with the rules of the House.

The gentleman from Georgia offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: Page 37, strike out lines 3 and 4 and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"(7) The Commission shall not less than 6 months following its appointment and confirmation submit to the Congress legislative recommendations which shall include but not be limited to—"

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, as the committee can understand from a reading of the amendment, its purpose and objective is that after the Commission has been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, then within 6 months the Commission must submit to the Congress for its consideration the legislative recommendations it thinks advisable.

You will see from an examination of page 37 of the bill that it would be amended to read this way:

The Commission shall, not later than 6 months following its appointment and confirmation, submit to the Congress legislative recommendations which shall include but not be limited to—

And then we enumerate and set out certain facts that the Commission must necessarily send up to the Congress for its consideration.

Following that another amendment will be offered to the effect that when the Commission submits its report to the Committee on Armed Services this committee will be required within 45 days to submit a report on the recommendations, or a bill or resolution. If it is a bill or resolution, it will be privileged and can be called up by any Member. Then will start the debate as to the type and character of the plan. In other

words, we are not delegating to the Executive; we are performing our responsibilities. One of our constitutional responsibilities is to provide and maintain an army. You cannot provide and maintain an army unless you have complete control of the various phases of the Army, its plans, and its program. So in this language now we are simply saying that the Commission must within 6 months send up to the House its plans and under the next amendment that those recommendations must be considered by the committee within 45 days. It does not come to the floor as a concurrent resolution; it comes in the form of a bill. It will be here like any other bill that comes before the Congress, it will be here under all parliamentary rules, except one. It is privileged and must be and can be called up by any Member of the House.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Why does the gentleman in his second amendment to be offered later insist on the 45-day privileged status? Why not let it go before his committee and that committee bring it out or not bring it out the same as any other bill?

Mr. VINSON. I do not want it pigeonholed in the committee, I do not want it blocked in the Rules Committee. I want the Congress to have an opportunity to pass on it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Do I understand the amendment that the gentleman proposes contemplates that there shall be a plan; in other words, the gentleman says the Commission within 6 months shall submit its plan which by the gentleman's Committee on Armed Services will be reported to the House within 45 days. Will it not be within the right of the Congress to turn down the plan altogether?

Mr. VINSON. Of course it will.

Mr. COX. And whatever plan is adopted will be the plan of the committee or the plan of the Congress?

Mr. VINSON. It will be the plan of the Congress. Let us understand that.

Mr. JUDD. Can the gentleman's committee amend this plan before it brings it out or must it bring the plan out in exactly the same form that the Commission submits it?

Mr. VINSON. The committee can, like we do here, write a brand new bill.

Mr. JUDD. The committee can?

Mr. VINSON. It merely has the advice of what the Commission recommends. We do not have to follow the advice. We can modify it or change it and when it comes to the House the House does not have to follow the views of the Armed Services Committee. The House can write whatever plan it wants to write.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Will the chairman of the committee, the gentleman now addressing the House, assure the House at this time that under no circumstances will he yield to striking out this part of the bill in the conference between the House and the Senate?

Mr. VINSON. I will say this at the outset: Whenever a man is so honored by the Speaker as to be named a member of a conference committee, it is his duty to carry out the views of the body that he represents. Now, whatever is written here in this bill in regard to the acts of the House, as one conferee, if I am so named by the Speaker, I will try to carry out the views of the House that I represent. Of course, it may be impossible to get an agreement and we will have to come back for instructions on the part of the House. Any conferee on this bill or any other bill who goes beyond doing what he thinks his body wants him to do is exceeding his authority as a conferee. Everybody understands that whatever bill comes back will have to be agreed to by the House again, either by voting up or voting down the conference report.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I understand, then, the gentleman will stand firm on this amendment in conference?

Mr. VINSON. I will insist as vigorously as I can that the American Congress write the plan.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. In view of what the gentleman is saying now that whatever report comes up from the Commission, may I ask him, it will have to come before the gentleman's committee?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. What did the gentleman mean a while ago when he said he would not put up with any pigeonholing?

Mr. VINSON. We provide in the bill that the committee cannot pigeonhole it. It must report ultimately to the House so that the House can within 45 days work its will.

Mr. JENKINS. Then that is another instance of a commission telling the Congress what to do?

Mr. VINSON. Not at all.

Mr. JENKINS. Why is that not so if the gentleman's committee cannot do anything with it but bring it back? Why can you not reject it, why can you not pigeonhole it, if the Congress is going to legislate?

Mr. VINSON. We can kill it, we can write a plan of our own, we can bring it in here after the Commission has submitted its plan.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand the proposition, the gentleman's committee could not kill the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, it could kill it, probably, in the sense it could not do something within 45 days, but in substance it could write whatever it thought necessary to write.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to inquire, as a practical matter: The gentleman has said that the committee will write the bill the way it wants to; that it will take into consideration the recommendation of the Commission. Assume that the committee, of which the gentleman is the chairman, could not agree upon the terms of a bill; then, under this procedure, which is quite novel, I might say to the gentleman from Georgia, what would the situation be?

Mr. VINSON. Well, if the committee cannot agree, why, we will continue to work, as we have done repeatedly, until we do agree. Someone will give way until we get a plan out here.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand, you have a provision in here that requires your committee to bring the matter to the floor within 45 days.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, then, certainly if the committee could not agree, you could not bring it in within the 45 days.

Mr. VINSON. All right; then they submit to the House that they could not agree.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course; then on what would the House act?

Mr. VINSON. Then the House could act on whatever views the House wanted to act on.

Mr. HALLECK. It strikes me, I might say to the gentleman, that the idea of the Commission to study this matter is not, as far as I am concerned, a bad thing. I can see much good in it. But the compulsory provisions as against his committee that the gentleman has incorporated in this amendment certainly are a departure from the Hoover Commission proposals. For instance, when the Hoover Commission was set up it was directed to report to the Congress for action by the Congress. Now let me ask the gentleman one further question. Can he conceive of a situation 6 months and 45 days from now that might involve all-out war with tremendous other problems that would be confronting the Congress? Under those circumstances, does he think that the Congress should proceed to the consideration of this sort of a measure with no alternative left to the House of Representatives?

Mr. VINSON. Of course, the House can always act on any legislative matter that is laid before it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The commission that is provided for has no power to put into effect any plan that it might devise until there is congressional action.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. COX. And until such action by Congress the Commission serves only in an advisory capacity.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it a fact that if the gentleman's committee takes the Commission's report and reworks it and brings it up within 45 days, that is the bill that we would work upon?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. JUDD. And if the gentleman's committee should not do anything within 45 days, then any Member could bring up the Commission's report and the House would have to act upon that; is that a correct statement?

Mr. VINSON. No; I would say that it would be reported out by the committee. It will be acted on within 45 days and laid before the House in a certain, intelligent form for the House to act on one way or the other.

Mr. JUDD. So what will be called up is what your committee brings in after study of the Commission report?

Mr. VINSON. As a background of what the Commission has set up.

Mr. JUDD. What is called up is not necessarily the Commission report.

Mr. VINSON. No.

Mr. JUDD. It is what you do with the report.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Let me say this at the outset that I intend to support the gentleman's amendment as a great improvement over the present language contained in the bill. But, there is one question I would like to ask, rather one criticism that I would like to make of the gentleman's amendment, and that is I do not understand exactly whether the House will be able to give full consideration to this legislation when it is called up under a privileged motion.

Mr. VINSON. Let me read the next amendment so that you will get it all clear:

The Commission shall, not later than 6 months following its appointment and confirmation, submit to the Congress legislative recommendations which shall include, but not be limited to.

Note that "which shall include, but not be limited to" certain things we put in the bill.

Then, on page 38, the amendment is to strike out all of lines 1 through 20, inclusive, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

(1) The legislative recommendations provided for in paragraph (7) shall have been enacted with or without amendments into law: *Provided*, That such recommendations shall be referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and both committees shall, not later than the expiration of the first period of 45 calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the recommendations provided for in paragraph (7) of this subsection are transmitted to the Congress, report thereon to their respective Houses: *Provided further*, That any bill or resolution so reported shall be privileged and may be called up by any Member of either House but shall be subject to amendment as if it were not so privileged.

That is the whole system.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield further, as I understand that language it contemplates action by the Com-

mittee on Armed Services to report a bill or resolution to the House.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me get back to my original inquiry: If the committee cannot agree on such a resolution or bill, what then would be the circumstance? To my mind, nothing would be reported or could be reported, hence there would be nothing before the House for consideration; that is, I take it that the recommendation of the Commission would not have the status of an introduced bill or resolution.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, it would not.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman would be the first to insist that his committee act upon it and report it as a bill.

Mr. VINSON. That is right; exactly.

Mr. HALLECK. If anyone sought to circumvent his committee, I am quite sure he would be quite vigorous in his denunciation of any such tactics.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly.

Mr. HALLECK. To my mind, it presents the very definite question as to what the situation would be if the gentleman's committee could not agree on a bill.

Mr. VINSON. If the committee could not agree, or the House could not agree and did not write a bill, they would not have any bill. You would not have any plan to operate the universal-military-training language. You just would not have a plan. You have to do something, and this is an effort to start it. If the House says, "No; we will turn it down," you do not have a plan then. You would have to start all over again. If the Commission says, "This is my plan," and the committee says, "We won't accept it, but we will submit to the House this plan," and then the House says, "We won't accept that," why, it goes back and you do not have a plan then. What I am driving at is this—let the Congress write the plan.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, I am for that, as I said earlier to the gentleman. I do not object to the appointment of the Commission. To my mind, that would be a good thing.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. However, is not the essence of the gentleman's proposal the appointment of the Commission and the report of that Commission to the Congress, the report being some sort of basis upon which the Congress would then undertake to act?

Mr. VINSON. It could be the basis, but it does not have to be the conclusion. It could be the basis, but it does not have to be what the committee recommends.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I call the gentleman's attention to the provisions of the amendment which requires the

committee to report to the House within 45 days and report upon the Commission's recommendations. This does not require the committee to report to the House within 45 days a bill for a plan, but requires the committee to report to the House upon the Commission's recommendations. If the committee could not agree with the recommendations, it would report to the House within 45 days that it could not agree, and comply with the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. What is this privilege of which the gentleman spoke? The gentleman says any Member could call up the bill on a privileged motion. What is privileged, then?

Mr. VINSON. The privileged matter would be any bill or resolution so reported.

Mr. BONNER. Who would report it if the committee could not agree on reporting it to the House? What would be reported?

Mr. VINSON. Now the gentleman is splitting hairs and is dodging around matters which cannot arise.

Mr. BONNER. How much debate would there be on this privileged matter?

Mr. VINSON. It would be privileged, but you could go before the Committee on Rules and get a rule to have it considered like the other bill.

Mr. BONNER. What would be privileged? Would it be the Commission report which would be privileged?

Mr. VINSON. It would be either the Commission's report, if we could not agree on a bill to be reported, or else it would be the bill reported out by the committee. You see, what we are driving at is that we are trying to get it on the floor of the House and let the House say what kind of a plan should be adopted. That is what we are trying to do and that is the whole objective.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. If the committee votes down this proposal, may I ask him whether we will have a straight-out universal military training proposal to vote on on final passage?

Mr. VINSON. If you vote this down and it comes in as the committee reported it out, then you have a proposal which falls within the category of the reorganization bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it ought to be made clear that it is not the report of the Commission which has a privileged status, but it is the bill which the committee formulates based upon such reports as may be filed.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If I understand the situation, the gentleman desires to have this matter acted on today so as to make certain that the House, within 6 months and 45 days from now, will pass upon the question of universal military training, is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. It is for the purpose of requiring the Commission, within a 6 months' period to do something about inaugurating a plan so far as it is concerned.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, if the Committee on Armed Services 6 months and 45 days from now, or even 45 days from now, or the day after tomorrow, would bring out a universal military training bill, it seems rather certain that the Congress would have an opportunity to pass upon that measure, does it not?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, the Congress could pass upon it whenever it is presented here.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then why is it necessary to decide today on whether we are going to bring out a universal military training proposal for consideration 6 months and 45 days from now, or 3 months from now, or 45 days from now?

Mr. VINSON. May I point out that that line of argument has no particular application to this amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No, but it has a lot of common sense to it, I might say to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. That may be true, and that would be a very pertinent argument under the proper circumstances.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. A little common sense would not hurt, with reference to this measure.

Mr. VINSON. No; and I am glad that the gentleman is beginning to use a little of it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I hope that I can contribute a little common sense to the debate here and also hope that we may dispense with levity on such an important matter as this.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is contributing some common sense to the debate, and I appreciate it. May I say the gentleman's criticism would be pertinent and germane when the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] moves to strike out the universal military training phase of it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman feel that he is justified in criticizing another Member for asking a question on the floor and trying to get an answer?

Mr. VINSON. I think the gentleman is perfectly right in making the observation as to the right of the Congress to pass upon the proposal, and the observation I made was no reflection on him.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman will agree, I think, that the Committee on Armed Services can bring out a universal military-training bill any time it wants to and that the House can vote on it.

Mr. VINSON. I agree that the Committee on Armed Services has jurisdiction to bring it out.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And may I add also that the gentleman always brings out any bill that he desires to bring out.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] asked a pertinent question about the de-

bate on the proposal as a privileged matter whenever the bill comes out. I think the answer to that is that like debate on an appropriation bill, the time is agreed upon. Furthermore, the House would go into the Committee of the Whole, and if the time is not agreed upon before resolving into the Committee of the Whole, the agreement would be made later. I do not know of a case when the time was not agreed upon. Therefore, that is a matter that can very easily be taken care of, as I see it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS. If these amendments that you propose are adopted, will a Member, if he votes for the bill after the amendments are adopted, be indicating that he is for some kind of universal military training?

Mr. VINSON. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. If this amendment and other amendments are agreed to, you have accomplished this, and this is all you have accomplished: You have set up the machinery, you have set up a commission, you have set up a corps, and Congress later on, in bill form, will write the program. That is all you have done here if you adopt this.

Mr. MORRIS. I do not think the gentleman has quite answered my question. I want to know whether or not, as the proponent of these amendments, you feel that if a Member votes for the bill after your amendments are adopted, that he is, at least to some extent, expressing himself in favor of universal military training.

Mr. VINSON. I cannot answer that question. I cannot answer how a man is going to straighten his own conscience with his mind or his mind with his conscience or what not.

Mr. MORRIS. That is not the reason I asked the question. I am not worried about my own conscience in the matter. You know what is in the amendments better than anybody else. I have given some consideration to them since you have presented them here. I want to know whether or not that will be an expression of approval of some form of universal military training.

Mr. VINSON. I will say this is the first step in inaugurating the machinery under which universal military training, in an orderly fashion, can be put into operation by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MORRIS. That is a definite answer. That is true. That is the first step.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take 10 minutes to talk as calmly and as coolly as I can about these amendments. If we pay attention, I think perhaps we can clear up some of the doubts and perplexities that are in the minds of all of us.

Yesterday morning every member of the Armed Services Committee present, 29 of us, voted for this amendment, not because we liked it but because it is the lesser of two evils.

Under the present bill as written, when the Commission is created, it is required to give a report within 6 months' time. Then the Committee on Armed Services would have to vote up or vote down that plan submitted by the Commission, without crossing a "t" or dotting an "i." It would be a cowardly abdication of the powers of Congress to turn over to the executive branch of the Government the power to legislate for us.

Under the proposed amendment offered by our distinguished chairman a commission is established in the same manner. It reports in 6 months, but when that report or plan or recommendation is submitted to the Committee on Armed Services, then the Committee on Armed Services is free to consider that plan or those recommendations just as it considers any other bill. They can vote it up or they can vote it down, or they can amend it in any such fashion as they might choose. That is the chief difference between the pending bill and the proposed amendment. But having stated that, I want to say to you that it is a rather foolish and futile gesture, and we are placing ourselves in a ludicrous position, and we are doing it for this reason: Here, the Congress this afternoon, in April 1951, is attempting to pass legislation that will authorize Congress at some future date to pass a bill. Is it not silly? It is downright silly. Why place ourselves in such a ridiculous position?

Now, this move, of course, by our astute and resourceful chairman, was to get votes; it was to get the boys who are on the fence, who are wobbly, and who have not made up their minds definitely. It is a sop; it is a little molasses. Talk about attempting to soothe one's conscience; this bill has been watered down; it has been rendered more or less innocuous, and foolish, and futile. But that is exactly what we are attempting to do here. Congress passed a law that will compel us to take action at some future time; of course, the same Congress will be here 6 months from now, but if it were next year, then perhaps a different Congress would have to pass upon this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this morning I received a letter from one of the greatest and wisest men I have ever been privileged to know, Harry Emerson Fosdick. He is a great student of theology and religion and for years was pastor of the Riverside Memorial Church in the city of New York. In my opinion, he and Joseph Sizoo are the two greatest

preachers I have ever heard. These men know not only their theology and religion, they are also great students of moral, social, economic, and political question. They understand Government and military problems as well. Above all, they understand human nature.

Here in two brief paragraphs Harry Emerson Fosdick hit the nail squarely on the head and drove home the big point we attempted to make last week in the opening of the debate, that there are not enough young men in this country to take care of the draft and universal military training at the same time, and that this law would have to be implemented in the future, perhaps even the distant future by some distant Congress; that no one Congress can bind another; and you cannot vote for a military appropriation for more than a 2-year period.

This letter is headed "Harry Emerson Fosdick, 4, The High Road, Bronxville, N. Y.":

APRIL 9, 1951.

MY DEAR MR. SHORT: I have been told on good authority that if the new proposal by Mr. VINSON to get the House to approve UMT in principle is accepted, the House-Senate conference may substitute the Senate-approved version. The American people are not likely to be happy about any device which results in a permanent program of universal military conscription.

I have sat in many conferences with our great chairman from Georgia, and I know he is tougher than a pine knot; I know that he will carry out his promise and pledge to you. But I know that no conferee can be absolutely bound before he goes into conference or you never could reach an agreement, and I also know that those Senators who are members of the Armed Services Committee in the other body happen to have minds of their own. While I do not entertain any great fears or grave doubts of our capitulating and surrendering to the Senate, yet there is always that possibility, and Harry Emerson Fosdick is absolutely right.

Here is the second and last paragraph of this letter:

Why should this Congress shoulder the political responsibility for the adoption of permanent UMT when it cannot be put into effect until the emergency is over? General Eisenhower and others have told us that this may be a long emergency, possibly lasting 10 or more years. Should not the generation and the Congress which must deal with the post-emergency world also make the decision on post-emergency military policy?

Most sincerely yours,

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK.

Let us cross that bridge when we get to it. Why muddy the waters now? Why not continue the present Draft Act as it is for another 3 years, upon which our people are united and which would pass the House without a dissenting vote?

We had only one vote against the extension of it last year and that gentleman from New York, Mr. Marcantonio, is not here any longer.

Now, I voted for this proposed amendment in committee, I will vote for it now, but I am going to vote against the whole blooming business. Every member of

the committee knows what my position is and the Members of the House know my position.

If we are wise, as I said last week, we will vote for the Barden substitute bill which will divorce universal military training from the draft, that will continue the present law to meet all of our requirements and that will make it possible for our armed services to bring in other legislation at the appropriate time. We cannot have universal military training in this country until this present emergency is over and much as I respect commissions and committees, it is hard for me to conceive of any commission the President might set up—I do not know whether he is going to name Oscar Ewing or Lillenthal, or who he may name to that Commission—I cannot conceive of any commission that in the next 6 months can learn nearly as much about universal military training as the members of the Committee on Armed Services, most of whom have lived with this problem for many years. No commission should write legislation, but only the Congress. It is our sole authority and duty under the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is uncalled for, it is untimely, it is dangerous. We should vote for the Barden bill that will soon be offered as a substitute for this measure and we will all have clear consciences; then we will go forth as a united people and not sharply divided over this bitter controversial issue. I have tried to make my position clear.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. In view of the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri that he will vote for this amendment but still vote against the bill, I assume that the gentlemen feels that no matter what the position of an individual Member may be, in favor of or against the Barden bill or in favor of or against the committee bill, the provision offered in the amendment now pending is a proper one and should be adopted?

Mr. SHORT. I do. I frankly admit it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. I would just like to further follow up the gentleman's statement in reference to Dr. Fosdick by saying that not only Dr. Fosdick but every single religious leader in this Nation, Catholic and Protestant, are on record in the gentleman's committee against UMT.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is eminently correct, so are the agricultural

organizations, including the National Grange and the Farm Bureau.

Mr. POWELL. Every single religious organization.

Mr. SHORT. And most of our educators.

Mr. POWELL. The Council of Bishops, Roman Catholic Church, the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church, the American Baptist Convention, the National Conference of Methodist Youth, Church of the Brethren, Southern Baptist Church, Society of Friends, Disciples of Christ, United Lutheran Church, Evangelical and Reformed Church—right on down the line. They are all against UMT. I agree with the gentleman, let us vote for the Barden bill and have what the Nation needs, a draft, and not what some people want.

Mr. SHORT. I plead, I prayerfully beg every one of you to vote for the Barden bill. Let us settle this for the time being. Now is no time to fight among ourselves. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] for his valuable contribution.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman recalls that one member of the church who indorsed the conference report for a permanent UMT and who appeared before our committee in strong support thereof was the Reverend Edmund A. Walsh, vice president of Georgetown University?

Mr. SHORT. That is true. He is a fine and great man but he is an exception to the rule. Most all great religious leaders are against it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I addressed a question to the chairman of the committee as a matter of eliciting information in respect to what the situation might be if after the Commission reports the Committee on Armed Services found itself unable to agree upon a measure to be reported. The proposed amendment that is to follow clearly refers to a bill or resolution, not a report to a bill or resolution, which would necessarily contemplate action by the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SHORT. If we do not resolute, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana, I do not see what the Congress could do about it. It is the impotency of this thing, the futility, the foolishness, of creating another commission and spending a lot more of the taxpayers' money to take care of some political parasites, that stagger me. Let us not have any of that. We have too much already.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the name of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick carries great weight with me since he is a graduate of the same institution that I am and served on the board of trustees of that university with me. But, his mission in life is to cultivate the religious and theological welfare of our citizens. My responsibility and yours is the preservation of the welfare and the security and the defense of our country.

First, with respect to the question raised by the gentleman from Indiana, which is entirely appropriate, as to what would happen in case the committee could not agree within the 45-day period. Has it ever happened or is it conceivable that a committee or a majority of its members would not agree? This committee amendment does not require the committee to unanimously approve a recommendation of the Commission to be created or unanimously endorse some plan. A majority of the committee will determine the recommendation of that Commission, and the report of the majority of that committee will be submitted to the House whether the majority may favor a particular plan or be opposed to it. The committee will report by a majority of its members, just as is the ordinary practice in any other legislative resolution or bill.

Respectfully, I cannot agree at all with my theological, religious, learned friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] when he asserts that this is a silly, incongruous position for us to take. To me, it is entirely logical and consistent. Those who want a plan of some kind, those who realize and recognize that if it is at all possible to discontinue drafting men for service we must start the machinery to develop a reservoir of trained civilians, realize that they must see the plan of training before they put their stamp of approval upon it.

But, there is another factor which I think is overlooked in the consideration of this approach to a problem which affects the lives of so many of our citizens. We lose sight of the fact that this Commission under the bill not only makes recommendations with respect to the program of training, but this very Commission, assuming the Congress eventually adopts a program of universal military training, administers that program. So, is it not highly essential that the Congress take a look at the complexion of the members of that Commission to see whether there are any Oscar Ewings, or Lillienthals, or Rosenbergs, or Smiths, or Coles on it in order that they may make sure of two things: First, that the plan is proper, sensible, and acceptable from a military standpoint, and that the people who are going to run it are the right kind of folks to run it? To me that is a logical and sensible way of approaching the proposition.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. What is there that a Commission could do better than the members of the Committee on Armed Services in setting this policy? Why have a commission? I think you on the committee must show to the Congress that the Commission can do better in setting this policy than you can.

Mr. COLE of New York. Well, all the Commission does is to make recommendations. As has been said many times here on the floor the committee eventually will work out the program, and after that the Congress will work its will. Of course, the committee is equipped to do it.

I want to make reference to the fear that has been thrown up here, from my standpoint largely as a smoke screen, as a straw that some people are seeking to grasp to justify their position in opposition to any kind of military training, and that is the fear that the House conferees are going to capitulate to the Senate conferees and accept the Senate provision with respect to universal military training. You know as well as I that whatever the House conferees do with respect to the conference with the Senate is not binding on this House, and whatever recommendations the House conferees may make must be approved finally by a majority of the Members of this House. So let us not try to build up too many straw men or search for skeletons in the closets or conjure ghosts under the bed in a frantic search for some argument which will give a plausible but specious reason for opposing a measure which is so very vital to the national security. Let us be honest with ourselves and the people; if we are against giving consideration to any kind of military training program, let us have the courage to say so.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman feel that any commission which might be set up under this bill would have a better knowledge of the questions involved in connection with the status of a universal military training program than would the members of the Committee on Armed Services themselves, most of whom have spent many years studying that subject?

Mr. COLE of New York. No; I do not.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Why is it necessary to have a commission? Why not let the committee itself do the work, which you would have to do eventually, anyhow?

Mr. COLE of New York. Who is going to run the training program?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The committee of course would determine that in any legislation it might report.

Mr. COLE of New York. All the many groups which have given study to this problem have recommended that the program be run by a commission of civilians.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am talking about establishing a law for universal military training. Does not the gentleman believe the committee is more able to recommend a bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. The Commission I am talking about is the one that runs the law after the plan is approved.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTTON: On page 37, strike out lines 3 through 22, inclusive, and substitute the following:

"The Commission shall conduct such studies as it may deem appropriate in order to carry out the purposes of this act and shall, on or before January 15, 1952, submit a report thereon to the Congress."

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all three of the amendments which I have been read at this time, because they refer to the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the other two amendments for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. SUTTON:

On page 38, strike out lines 1 through 20, inclusive, and substitute the following:

"(1) The Congress, following the date on which the report provided for in paragraph (7) of this subsection is transmitted to the Congress, has enacted legislation setting out the provisions which shall govern the National Security Training Corps; and."

On page 39, strike out lines 2 through 7, inclusive.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, the first amendment provides that the Commission set up under S. 1 shall make a study and not report a plan, but shall report to the Committee on Armed Services, and in turn the Congress of the United States shall legislate accordingly. The Armed Services Committee then writes a universal military training plan, under the power delegated to the Armed Services Committee. They bring the plan in to the Congress of the United States. Then we vote on it.

I am glad the distinguished gentleman from Georgia and I are a little closer together in this instance, because he wants the Congress of the United States and the Armed Services Committee to write the plan. I do, too. I do not want to delegate the power of the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Agriculture, or any other committee of the Congress of the United States to any outside commission. I do not want any outside commission to write a plan to bring to the Committee on Armed Services. I want the Committee on Armed Services to write their own plan.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Committee on Armed Services has some of the most intelligent men on military affairs in the United States. I do not believe there are 29 members of the Armed Forces who know more about the armed services of the United States than the 29 members of the House committee. I have the highest respect for them. I know they have been giving a great deal of study to the subject of universal military training. If we want to set up a commission they should make recommendations and then let the Committee on Armed Services write the plan that you and I are to vote for or vote against. In so doing, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has the same thought in mind as I have. We just disagree in that he wants a

commission to write a plan and I want the Congress to do the legislating.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. Is it not a fact that the President of the United States can set up a committee or a commission any time he wants to to study anything and to submit recommendations and act in an advisory capacity? So why should we be worrying about that at this time?

Mr. SUTTON. The argument of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is that this Commission is set up to carry out the program of universal military training. I think the committee and Congress should direct how the universal military training program shall be administered.

Mr. BUSBEY. They could have their own staff study it, could they not?

Mr. SUTTON. That is true, but too many members of commissions have the staff doing all the work.

The second amendment provides that following the date of this report no person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until after Congress passes a universal military training bill.

On page 39 my amendment strikes out lines 2 through 7, inclusive. This is a section of the bill which is not needed. I believe the gentleman from Georgia will agree that the provision is useless should this amendment be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, the matter comes down to this—the amendment which the gentleman from Georgia offered is better than his original bill; but at the same time it still says that a commission shall draw up the plan. That is a power which is delegated to the Congress of the United States, as set out by the Constitution of the United States. My amendment provides for the Commission to make a report on or before January 15, 1952, to the Committee on Armed Services; then the Congress would consider the committee recommendations. In that way we do not delegate our power to any commission of three or five men, but we take the responsibility right here. We will not be letting anybody write our bills, but we will be writing them ourselves. I think the Congress of the United States should know more about this question than any commission that could be appointed.

The only difference between the gentleman from Georgia and myself is that he wants a commission to write the plan and I want the Congress to do it. That is what my amendment does.

I am in hopes that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services will accept this amendment to his amendment because I think we are driving at the same thing. We want the Committee on Armed Services to write this bill because we do not even know that we will be in session 6 months and 45 days from now. Six months and 45 days from now, which is November, we may not even be here.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it would provide for the establishment of a commission which could make recommendations, but it would be left to the Congress, and with the Committee on Armed Services, to decide whether or not such recommendations should be followed or enacted into law.

Mr. SUTTON. Definitely.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If that is the case, I will certainly support the gentleman's amendment because I recall the Congress established the so-called Hoover Commission which I believe has accomplished much, and has received great recognition throughout the country. At the time it was created there was no authority given to the Hoover Commission to do anything further than to submit a report and recommendations to the Congress. The Congress itself retained complete power and authority to pass upon the Commission's recommendations as it saw fit; and to accept, reject, or do as it pleased with them. That is exactly what the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee proposes, as I understand it?

Mr. SUTTON. That is exactly what my amendment does.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In other words, you propose the same sort of commission in connection with universal military training that we had in the Hoover Commission?

Mr. SUTTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then, if that is true, I will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. There is a point that has been suggested. That is, that in the committee amendment and in the Vinson amendment each of them bypass the Rules Committee. May I ask you, Does your amendment bypass the Rules Committee?

Mr. SUTTON. This would not bypass the Rules Committee.

Mr. FULTON. So that is another difference.

Mr. SUTTON. Yes; it would not bypass the Rules Committee. It would be the same as any other bill.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. There is this big difference between the Hoover Commission set-up and this Commission. The Hoover Commission was set up to make recommendations to reorganize the executive departments, which we accept or reject.

Mr. SUTTON. That is right.

Mr. BROOKS. And then the committee ceased to function. Here is a Commission set up for the purpose of carrying out the terms of the law provided by Congress. They make recommendations to the committee. The committee accepts them or rejects them. If the committee accepts the program which the Congress finally enacts into law, then that same Commission will be charged with the responsibility of executing the laws of Congress.

Mr. SUTTON. I realize what the gentleman is saying. I am sure he does not want to delegate any of the responsibility of the Armed Services Committee to any commission.

Mr. BROOKS. We asked the Department of Agriculture for recommendations, and we know that they are going to carry out the law.

Mr. SUTTON. That is true.

Mr. BROOKS. Then we write the law.

Mr. SUTTON. Then we write the law, and that is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Did I understand correctly that we would be committing ourselves in advance to a program whereby this Commission which prepared the plan would carry out the plan?

Mr. SUTTON. In my amendment this Commission will not write any plan. The Armed Services Committee will write the plan.

Mr. JUDD. I understood the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] to say that if the Congress went ahead and adopted a universal military training program, this Commission would then carry it out.

Mr. SUTTON. This Commission is to be set up in this bill only to study and report.

Mr. JUDD. Only to study and report?

Mr. SUTTON. Only to study and report; not a plan at all.

Mr. JUDD. Who is to operate the plan, should we adopt it? That would be determined in the legislation which the committee adopted, would it not?

Mr. SUTTON. Under this bill it sets up a commission. We do not change that at all. This Commission then will report, after its findings, to the Armed Services Committee, not a plan, but what they found out. Then the Armed Services Committee will sit down and write a plan. Then they will bring that to the Congress and we will vote on it as any other bill.

Mr. JUDD. And we could use this Commission or anyone else that we decide should operate the program.

Mr. SUTTON. That is true.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Does the gentleman leave in the language on page 35, lines 18 and 20, which provide that at such time as the Commission shall be appointed in accordance with this paragraph, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps? Are those words left in?

Mr. SUTTON. I have no amendment on pages 35 and 36 at all.

Mr. VORYS. That means, then, that under both the Vinson amendment and the gentleman's amendment we create a National Security Training Corps, but we do not say what it is until after the Congress decides what this corps shall consist of. Is that correct?

Mr. SUTTON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, if there ever was a subject which has been studied, this is it. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] as a substitute for the committee amendment would result in nothing in the world but delay. Whether you are going to vote for or against universal military training, I plead with you, I beg of you to have the courage to vote today for it or against it. Whichever way you vote I am not going to criticize; but let us not duck and dodge any longer. Let us come right up and vote for or against UMT.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. Not at this time.

The Compton Commission was one of the highest order, and it studied this question and reported it to the Congress in a Republican administration, under a bill offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Towel], and we thoroughly studied the matter and reported the bill. So it is time to vote on it, and let us not put it off for some commission to make some study.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I must yield to the author of the amendment.

Mr. SUTTON. Then, in a case like that, why do we not have a plan here today?

Mr. KILDAY. I am going to discuss that. Not only I, but a number of other members of the Committee are amazed at the importance the plan has suddenly assumed, and it seems quite strange that a great many people who have consistently opposed legislation of this kind are those who seem to place the most importance on the plan. There has never heretofore been a bill in which restrictions were placed upon the nature of the plan of training to be followed. We put that in here as an abundance of precaution to give us a chance to look at it, to make sure that it was a program of military training, and not a great socialized training program, so that there would be no danger of their attempting to carry into the military training such things as they had in the bill that came from the Department providing for the rehabilitation physically and mentally of those who were substandard and incapable of taking training. I say to you frankly that that was the thing we did not want, we did not want these boys to be trained in ceramics and the social arts and in welfare programs; and, very frankly, from the very first Selective Service Act there has been an element in the country which has attempted to bring programs of that kind into the Selective Service System.

On the question of the plan, frankly none of us here in this room can write a plan of military training, and we would never attempt to set up what constitutes basic military training; and the military, I am sure, would not attempt to lay down today what constitutes an unchangeable

plan of military training, because the nature of war might change tomorrow and then they would have to change the nature of their training. It is not possible for us, we are not military experts. We are setting up a commission which is dominated by civilians—three civilians, one of them to act as Chairman, and two military men. How could it be possible for us to write the details into law? It is no delegation of legislative authority when we say that the Commission is going to say how many hours of close order drill they must give the men who go under training in this program, how many hours of maneuvers they shall have, how many hours of classroom work. Those are only administrative details, and in order to avoid some of the things that very unfortunately have grown up in our country and the minority groups are able to put over their will on certain branches of the Government, we wrote in the power to go over the plan and see to it that it was military training.

The bill of the Senate is now under heavy attack because the contention is made that the bill provides for national service. Our bill provides for a system of military training, but not compulsory national service. So when the Commission gets together they are to find out from consultation with military men and with civilians to see that the military side is not overemphasized, that there is no danger of militarization of our youth, and they are going to determine the moral welfare. How can we determine what number of chaplains should be furnished for every thousand men? How can we determine the amount of recreation there should be and the moral environment in which these boys should be? That is the purpose of the Commission, and in every program that has ever been suggested for military training until the Department's bill came up it has been expected that this program would be under the control of a civilian commission, and one of the primary objections, certainly one that I had to the bill that was sent up here by the Department, was that it provided nothing other than military control of our youth; and I would not stand for that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. I know you would not stand for that, and the members of the committee would not stand for it. We went back to the Compton Commission report and got a civilian commission to be in charge of this program to the end that these boys would not be brought in and placed under the immediate control of the Regular service. That bill also contemplated that when the 18-year-old or 18½-year-old boys came in they would be integrated with troops of the Regular Army. That is the kind of a bill that the Department asked for here. We did not want that to happen and we did not want the great social programs

being brought in. We wanted to watch both of them and we provided that a plan should be sent up here so that we would know we were getting what we intended to get and what the people were paying for, military training of the youth to go into the Reserves and be ready should they be needed.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. This Commission to be established shall serve at a per diem rate of pay, showing it is only a commission that is set up at intervals. Who is going to call it into session after they have set up this thing? Who is going to run the whole program? If they are scattered throughout the United States and called at intervals, who is going to run the program when they are not in session?

Mr. KILDAY. Let me say to the gentleman there are things in that section which I would like to have changed. I would like to have the provision that the Commission shall act under the direction of the President eliminated. I may say that I am somewhat responsible for the per diem instead of an annual salary. I made the suggestion in committee and it was agreed to. The original provision called for an annual salary. Very frankly, some appointments made recently to positions paying \$12,500 to \$15,000 a year on a permanent basis have been given to the type of men I do not want to see run the UMT program. I want men like Karl Compton and other great educators, men of integrity, men in religion, who might not be able to give up their present occupations in order to serve on a full-time basis. But if the House wants to make it on a full-time basis, very well, I think you will probably get a couple of defeated Congressmen on your first Commission.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I ask a question on this point: The Armed Services Committee has the policy-forming duty for the services now, all of them, the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. FULTON. Under your right now you have millions of men in training, in basic training. You do not have a commission to tell you how to make policies now. Why, then, should you need it in the future?

Mr. KILDAY. We have men in training now, yes; but only as an incident of service. The men we have now are in the service for combat, they are there to serve as soldiers, to go where they are told, and do what they are told. We do not want any commissars with the Army in the field. But when you come to training annually 500,000 youths out of high school, we do not want them to be subjected to complete rigid military control for the very same reason we exempt them in this bill from action by court martial. Should anyone be charged with any serious crime or major offense, he would, of course, be triable either in the Federal court or in the State court, de-

pending on whether jurisdiction had been ceded.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman is missing my point. May I make it a little clearer?

Mr. KILDAY. I think it is quite clear.

Mr. FULTON. We set the policy for the training of these youth. The Armed Services Committee set that up. They are the ones who did it without a commission advising them.

Mr. KILDAY. I shall not yield further. I get the gentleman's point. We have never at any time said what character of military training there should be. We have never said he shall be trained in close-order drill or trained in tanks or anything of that kind. That has always been left completely with the military. But in connection with a long-range program and considering the unfortunate experiences we have had in the past of people attempting to use a worthy program for some special idea they had, in my opinion, perhaps changing the ways of our society, we wanted to make sure that when the entire youth of the country was going into this, it was going to be a limited period of military training and under civilian control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. In the gentleman's opening statement he was very frank, and I admire him for the position he takes, in saying that we might as well get down to the crux of the question. That is the question of whether or not we establish UMT. Did I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. ARENDS. My position has been this, not whether or not the individual is for UMT or whether we should pass a draft bill at this particular time, but UMT should come in here and stand on its own merits, on its own feet, at the proper time.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman knows I insisted from the beginning, and made General Marshall quite angry with me, that the bill be in such a position that it could be separated, with a separate vote on UMT and the other. I hope to have some time when it is germane under the proposal of the Barden substitute to explain in detail why I think it is essential that we have a UMT program to follow the draft, so that in an orderly fashion we can build up the Reserves as we diminish the active duty force and thereby eventually create a strong Military Establishment, backed by adequate Reserves.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, since some confusion has apparently resulted from the intro-

duction of the amendment by the chairman, I feel it best that there be some explanation of the events that led up to this amendment. When this bill was originally reported to the House by the Committee on Armed Services it contained a provision that the Commission was to submit a plan to the Congress, which plan was to be referred to the Committee on Armed Services. However, neither these committees, nor Congress itself, was permitted to change the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i" in that plan. We had to accept the plan of the Commission as written by it or reject the plan in its entirety. That we were required to do by concurrent resolution. Obviously that was an unconstitutional delegation of power. If the bill had remained in that condition, the Commission would do the legislating, the Congress would either rubber-stamp what the Commission suggested or reject the same entirely. We would have nothing to say about the plan after it had been adopted except, of course, Congress would always have the authority to consider any bill that might be introduced by any Member to repeal the law or to modify it in any respect.

After the bill reached the floor it became apparent to the chairman of our committee and to others that that phase of the bill was highly objectionable and unconstitutional. The chairman drafted an amendment, which he presented last Friday afternoon at a time when I was expressing my opposition on this phase of the bill. That amendment provided that the plan was to be submitted by the Commission but that it was subject to amendment by the Committees on Armed Services or on the floor of either House. However, under this proposed amendment after the plan had been amended in committee or on the floor it had to be accepted or rejected in its amended form by a concurrent resolution. I objected very strenuously to that provision on the theory that a concurrent resolution does not have the force of law, and I cited some authorities to support this contention. If we were to adopt the plan by that process, it would necessarily mean that the constitutional power of the President to approve or veto legislation would be circumvented. So after that objection was made, the chairman, who is always willing to compromise, called the Committee on Armed Services together and we unanimously agreed on the amendment that is before you today.

The amendment as now drafted gives the Congress the right to amend any plan that may be submitted by the Commission and provides that it shall be done in a legislative way and not by concurrent resolution. Therefore, in my judgment, if the pending committee amendment is accepted, Congress will have every opportunity to consider any plan that may be submitted by the Commission and amend it the same as we would amend any other legislative bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman comment on the relative merits of the

Sutton amendment and the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee?

Mr. ELSTON. Frankly, I do not see a lot of difference between them. The amendment of the committee does circumvent the Rules Committee. It permits whatever bill we may report out to be called up as a privileged measure. The Rules Committee would have nothing to say about it. Whether that is a wise provision I am not prepared to say. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, as I understand it, simply provides that the Commission shall make a report, which report I assume is in the form of recommendations. That is what would be done under the committee amendment. The committee amendment indicates that the report shall contain recommendations, which recommendations may be accepted or rejected or amended as we see fit. We can do the same thing under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. We can take the recommendations or we can reject them. We may change them in any manner we see fit, except that after the committee has considered a recommendation from the Commission, under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, a legislative bill would be reported and it would be referred to the Rules Committee and would be called up in the regular way. I think that is the principal difference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If the gentleman will yield, in the amendment now suggested by the gentleman's committee is any automatic power provided for the plan of the Commission to go into effect if the committee or the Congress does not act?

Mr. ELSTON. No; as I understand it, if the Commission submits a plan to our committee and our committee does not act, there is nothing for the House to vote upon. However, there is nothing to preclude the Commission from later submitting another plan. Furthermore, there is nothing to prevent any member of the committee or any Member of the Congress, for that matter, from introducing a universal military training bill and having it voted on in the regular way.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think the gentleman missed the point of my question. Could the report of this Commission automatically go into force and effect if the gentleman's committee did not act in 45 days?

Mr. ELSTON. No.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understood the proposal of the gentleman from Georgia and his explanation of it, he spoke of

preventing the Armed Services Committee from pigeonholing the proposition. Clearly that would indicate that there is contemplated in his amendment mandatory action as against the Armed Services Committee. If the gentleman from Georgia is correct, then the gentleman from Ohio in his last statement did not quite have the effect of the Vinson committee amendment correct.

Mr. ELSTON. If the gentleman will read the Vinson amendment he will find that the House will consider only such resolution or bill as may be reported by the committee. In view of this language if nothing is reported by the Committees on Armed Services we would have nothing to consider or vote upon on the floor of either the House or Senate. That in effect would be pigeonholing the bill in committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand it, both under the Vinson amendment and the Sutton amendment, this language would remain in the bill and become law:

At such time as the Commission shall be appointed, in accordance with this paragraph, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps.

Mr. ELSTON. There is no question about that.

Mr. VORYS. What is the status of that corps?

Mr. ELSTON. As soon as we pass the bill and create the Commission, and as soon as the Commission is appointed and confirmed by the President, the National Security Training Corps is automatically established.

Mr. VORYS. The Commission does not have to be confirmed. When they are appointed we have a National Security Training Corps. What is the status of the corps at that time?

Mr. ELSTON. I say "confirmed" because one of the committee amendments provides that the 6-month period for the submission of the Commission's recommendations shall date from the Commission's appointment and confirmation.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I think the gentleman will admit the proposed Vinson amendment was very carefully considered and debated by the committee; is that not correct?

Mr. ELSTON. There is no question but that it was carefully considered. While there may be objection to it, it is unique and it is decidedly to be preferred to the previous amendment suggested by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. That amendment required only a concurrent resolution.

Certainly the pending committee amendment is to be preferred over the present provision of the bill which allows the Commission to submit a plan which Congress could not change in any respect.

Mr. GAVIN. I might further point out to the Members of the House that the Vinson amendment was reported out unanimously with not a dissenting vote.

Mr. ELSTON. That is correct, and it is a definite improvement of the bill as it was originally reported.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. COX. Is it not perfectly apparent to the gentleman and to all others hearing this debate that those opposing the UMT provisions of the committee bill have won their fight and that the Vinson amendment means this and nothing more—an expression of concern or an expression of interest or desire for further exploration of the subject, all in the interest of establishing a basis for the enactment of a law if it is the will of the Congress to so legislate?

Mr. ELSTON. That is true to a certain extent. Whether you are for universal military training or against it, the amendment, in my judgment, should be adopted. The committee amendment had the support of both the proponents and the opponents of UMT.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, whether or not the Sutton amendment or the Vinson amendment is agreed to, there is language on page 36 of the bill which is very interesting and which I would like to ask the chairman of the committee as to what effect it may have. On page 36, beginning at line 8, it says:

The Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, direct and control the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training shall be basic military training. It shall establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial military training of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act—

And so forth. I take it, and I ask the chairman whether or not this is true, whether we have any other language in the bill as to the Commission making a plan and reporting it, or the committee itself making a plan and reporting to the House, that this subsection (5) beginning on line 8 of page 36 and extending to line 22, gives the Commission full power to do anything that it wants to in respect to training.

Mr. VINSON. It has no authority until the Congress approves the plan.

Mr. HINSHAW. It does not say so.

Mr. VINSON. If the Congress approves the plan, then the Commission carries out the plan that the Congress has approved.

Mr. HINSHAW. Where does it say so?

Mr. VINSON. It says that no person shall be inducted until the plan has been approved by the Congress.

Mr. HINSHAW. As I understood the previous language in the bill, the President could order a person inducted into the Security Training Corps just as soon as he eliminates the age limit of 18½. That is on a previous page. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. VINSON. Let me say this, that no man can be inducted into the Training Corps at the time he is being inducted for service. The bill provides when one shall terminate and the other commence.

Now, get this in mind. On page 37 the bill says:

No person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until after—

And then this amendment comes in—until after the Congress has approved the plan.

It is up to us, not by resolution, but by law, signed by the President and approved by the Congress by a majority vote.

Mr. HINSHAW. I cannot put my finger on the exact language that I had in mind. I am thinking about a different amendment, but with the gentleman's statement that they absolutely cannot be inducted until the Congress has adopted a plan, I will take it that way.

Mr. VINSON. Well, it is on page 37, at the bottom of the page, "No person shall be inducted" until these things happen.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I think I share the gentleman's concern. The gentleman has pointed out that on page 36 there is certain authority given to the Commission. That authority has not been amended in this amendment. That authority does become law right now, except that it cannot be exercised until after the plan is adopted. But unless changed, when the plan submitted by the Commission has been adopted or a new bill passed under that plan, this authority on page 36, subsection (5), remains.

Mr. VINSON. I would like to ask both gentlemen, Who would the Commission have any authority over? It would have no authority over anybody until the Congress approves the plan.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. What becomes of paragraph 5 on page 36?

Mr. VINSON. After you begin to induct, then it says the Commission shall run the organization by direction of the President.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Then it says:

The Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, direct and control the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training shall be basic military training—

And so on. That will be in effect.

Mr. VINSON. Nothing can happen until the Congress approves a plan. When the Congress approves a plan, then the Commission is authorized to go to work.

Mr. HINSHAW. At the bottom of page 33, where the second provision comes into effect for calling up this training corps, there is this language:

Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare that the period of

active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than 26 months, which may be designated in such resolution, or whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section—

And so forth.

Mr. VINSON. I invite your attention to line 19, where it says:

For induction into the National Security Training Corps as hereinafter established.

You cannot induct men into the corps until a plan has been approved. If the committee will understand this, there will be no more confusion. All that is being accomplished by this amendment and by the bill is establishing the machinery, the vehicle. We are building the house.

Mr. HINSHAW. I get the point. I have talked it over with the gentleman before.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the Members must well realize that if we wait until the time the emergency is over before we make up our minds what we are going to do about this UMT program, that it is going to take at least 6 months thereafter in order to arrange such a program. I think that the committee has allowed the Commission too little time; I think it is going to take the Commission a year rather than 6 months to do its work, and if we adopt this 6-months idea, we will just be expecting the committee to bring in a bill extending the time for the Commission to submit its plan. Actually, if you cannot tail these things one onto the other you are going to have a very serious lapse of time which I think this country can ill afford.

I am not saying that the Vinson amendment is any better than the Sutton amendment so far as its force and effect is concerned. In all probability the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] will do the same thing as the Vinson amendment without quite so much rigmarole involved in it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not significant, though, that the Committee on the Armed Services brought in by unanimous agreement among that committee the amendment that is offered here by the chairman on behalf of the committee?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; it is very significant indeed, and I for one appreciate their action in doing it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Under the amendment by the gentleman from Tennessee, there is no assurance that it would go to the Committee on the Armed Services; there is no assurance that all of these yardsticks on page 37 would ever be considered by the Commission in making its report.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman realizes that the Committee on the Armed Services gets all legislation relating to military matters.

Mr. VINSON. Not necessarily; it could go to the Committee on Expenditures; as a matter of fact the unification bill went to that committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. I had forgotten about that; the gentleman brought up one I had not remembered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may proceed for two additional minutes, that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. The gentleman is correct in his statement that a matter pertaining to the Armed Forces goes to the Committee on Armed Services. The gentleman from Georgia would raise the holy devil if it did not go to his committee, and he knows that as well as I.

Mr. HINSHAW. It probably would be rereferred if it did not go to his committee in the first instance.

Mr. SUTTON. And in the second place there are some of us who believe that the Congress of the United States should legislate instead of letting committees outside of Congress do the legislating that we are elected to do.

Mr. HINSHAW. The Committee on the Armed Services is such a splendid committee and they have had so much experience that I am a little surprised that they did not bring in something like the Towe bill to be tailed right onto the end of this bill. I wish they had done it so we could have acted on it now and not wait for 6 months from now.

Mr. SUTTON. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman from Georgia is trying to do us a great favor here by taking some Members off the spot. Personally, it does not bother me very much one way or the other.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Let us vote on it and get off the spot now; the Members have been on the spot long enough.

Mr. HINSHAW. That suits me.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be again read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Sutton amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SUTTON) there were—ayes 93, noes 163.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the amendment we just adopted refers to lines 3 and 4, page 37. I have an amendment to page 37, lines 5 through 9. Will I be permitted to offer that amendment after we vote on a subsequent section of the bill? If not, I desire to offer the amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. No; not after voting on a subsequent section of the bill. The gentleman would be entitled to recognition to offer an amendment after the committee amendments are disposed of, just as other Members having amendments would be entitled to recognition.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Even though they come after my amendment on the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Why, certainly. An amendment is in order to be offered to any part of section 1 of the bill, which consists of 50 pages.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 38, strike out lines 1 through 20, inclusive, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) the legislative recommendations provided for in paragraph (7) shall have been enacted with or without amendments into law: *Provided*, That such recommendations shall be referred to the Committees on Armed Services, and both Committees shall, not later than the expiration of the first period of 45 calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the recommendations provided for in paragraph (7) of this subsection are transmitted to the Congress, report thereon to their respective Houses: *Provided further*, That any bill or resolution so reported shall be privileged and may be called up by any member of either House but shall be subject to amendment as if it were not so privileged; and."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, as I stated to the committee when the other amendment was being considered, this amendment would follow, and this is what the committee unanimously recommended yesterday. This follows out the procedure by which the Commission

will be governed and the Congress will proceed with reference to inaugurating the plan. The Commission, as I have stated, will make its report to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Armed Services will send it to the floor of the House. Then it will be considered just like any other bill on the floor of the House and be open to amendment. It must be signed by the President of the United States and, as I pointed out when the gentleman from California was addressing the House, no inductee can be put in the training corps by the very language of the bill until the Congress approves the plan. So, I repeat again, here is what is accomplished by this bill as far as UMT is concerned. We establish the vehicle, we establish the Commission, we establish the training corps, and then Congress must step in at some future date and prescribe the type and character of the training. Even after that another thing must happen before anyone can be inducted. You must stop inducting for service; in other words, you stop the draft and you induct for training. Now, that can either be done by the Congress or it can be done by the President. Why do we put in there that it has to be done by the Congress? It is because it is costing \$35,000,000,000 a year now to run the armed services and after awhile the Congress might get tired and say, "We want to inaugurate another program, and we want the Armed Forces reduced," so therefore Congress passes a concurrent resolution and says, "We will stop drafting people in the country for the armed services; we will draft them for the training program." We are wise in doing that; we are on sound ground when we do that because it is the Congress that writes it instead of some commission. It makes no difference how ably it may be staffed. So I am hoping that this amendment, which is the amendment that was approved unanimously as was stated by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] will be accepted, because it is along the right line, and then later on we will have a clean-cut issue between the Barden amendment and those who believe in universal military training.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say awhile ago that any legislation presented by the Committee on Armed Services on this subject could not be pigeonholed by the Committee on Rules?

Mr. VINSON. It cannot be pigeonholed by anybody. It must come back to the floor of the House for the majority of 435 Members to work its will.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I am just curious to know this: There is one thing to be made permanent under the gentleman's plan, and that is the name of the thing.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. The name that everybody in the country calls UMT, which has the word "military" in it, is now going to be called national security training?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. Who invented that name?

Mr. VINSON. I wish I could have the honor of inventing it. It is a very appropriate name, but I would say the combined wisdom of 38 men on the committee invented it.

Mr. VORYS. Was it the purpose to eliminate the word "military"?

Mr. VINSON. No; not at all, not one particle. That is just the proper name for it.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that was the name given to the training corps in the Towe bill in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. VORYS. Is that where this came from?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes.

Mr. VORYS. Universal military training is to be called now national security training.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. DURHAM. It was based on the Compton report.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I was the one raising the question of the functions of the Committee on Rules with respect to this legislation coming back on the floor of the House. Why is there any intent to bypass the Rules Committee?

Mr. VINSON. There will be no bypassing the committee as long as I am a Member of the Congress. I will go before the Rules Committee. However, to be absolutely sure that there could be no opportunity anywhere to bottle it up, we make it privileged. That is all.

Mr. FULTON. That is a good statement.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. Would this be a majority of the elected Members or a majority of those present?

Mr. VINSON. It means a majority, just as we are going to vote here this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 39, strike out lines 2 through 7, inclusive.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the amendments adopted, this language comes out, because this has reference to the other system we had. It is purely in the interest of proper language.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 51, line 23, after the date July 1, 1954, strike out the period and add the following: "except persons now or hereafter deferred under section 6 of this title after the basis for such deferment ceases to exist."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, this really is a perfecting amendment, but I think a word of explanation may be necessary for the information of the Members.

As the committee progressed with the final drafting of the bill, the continuance of the provisions for draft for service was left on an indefinite basis subject to termination either by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress. During the deliberations in the drafting of the bill with respect to the deferment of individuals within the 18½ to 26 age bracket who might be deferred for agriculture or college or one thing or another, the committee amended section 6 of the present Draft Act to provide that every individual who may be deferred would be liable for service up to the age of 35, so that no college student or other deferred person would escape his liability for service because of his deferment. If he is under 35, he is still subject to the draft.

Subsequently the committee wrote a definite time limitation on the bill, July 1954. Of course, the result of that would be that all these men who are being deferred during the period between now and 1954 would escape liability completely after 1954. This amendment is offered to close that gap and make certain that those individuals who have been deferred will not escape their liability for service even after July 1, 1954.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELSTON: On page 51 strike out lines 11 to 20, inclusive, and in lieu thereof insert:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps, and no person shall be ordered to active duty pursuant to section 6 (d) (1), after July 1, 1954. Any person inducted into the National Security Training Corps prior thereto shall, not more than 6 months after that date be released from training in such corps, but shall not be relieved from his obligation to serve in a Reserve component as provided in section 4 (d) (3) of this title."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment speaks for itself, and does not require very much of an explanation. If you examine the bill you will find there is a definite termination date as to the selective-service features of the bill but none as to the universal-military-training program.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I did not hear the date of termination. What was it?

Mr. ELSTON. As to the selective-service features of the bill there is a definite termination day.

Mr. VINSON. What is the date of the termination of the selective service? I did not hear it.

Mr. ELSTON. July 1, 1954. As to the universal-military-training features of the bill, there is no termination date. Obviously the fixing of a definite termination date for selective service will require the Congress to reconsider the whole program sometime before that date. Since these two measures are being enacted as one, it seems logical and reasonable that a termination date should be considered as to both. My amendment means that Congress must review the entire program sometime before July 1, 1954. If Congress is satisfied that the program is working well and should be continued it is a very simple matter for the Congress to continue it. Just as we have continued the Draft Act a number of times, so can we continue the universal-military-training part of the bill if Congress after appropriate and full consideration decides that it should be continued. It makes no difference whether you are for the UMT program or against it. That is entirely beside the question. There should be a definite termination date so that those who are for the bill and so that those who are against it will have an opportunity to consider the whole program sometime before July 1, 1954. Who is in a better position to determine whether or not the program should be continued than Congress itself? If we adopt the bill without this amendment, we will pass on to the Commission the authority to go ahead with the program for an indefinite period, limited only by our approval of the Commission's plan and by congressional appropriations. The only way Congress can terminate the program, as the bill is now written, is by the passage of a concurrent resolution. By such a resolution we can either terminate the program or suspend inductions for a certain period of time. But is that the proper way to legislate on a matter as important as universal military training? Why should there be any fear of congressional review?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. YATES. The section to which the gentleman's amendment pertains refers to the term "Reserve component." As I understand the purpose of the training program, an inductee in the Training Corps will remain under universal military training for 6 months, after which he will go to the Reserve component.

Mr. ELSTON. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. Is that an inactive Reserve component or an active Reserve component? What is the nature of the Reserve component into which the graduate from the training corps will go?

Mr. ELSTON. The bill merely uses the term "Reserve component." I presume that will be one of the subjects included in the Commission's plan or it

could be taken care of by future legislation.

Mr. YATES. Has he a choice?

Mr. ELSTON. Not under the terms of this bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Naturally he will continue his training as a member of an active Reserve unit by attending drills and taking summer training.

Mr. ELSTON. I certainly hope that is the way it will be.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I could not hear the amendment when it was read. What is the termination date for induction in the National Training Corps?

Mr. ELSTON. The amendment provides that there shall be no inductions in the National Security Training Corps after July 1, 1954.

Mr. VINSON. Then you are making the termination of the draft and the termination of the UMT the same?

Mr. ELSTON. Exactly the same. I feel that when we consider the extension of one phase of the program we should consider both phases. I cannot have any sympathy with the claim that if we set up UMT we must make it permanent in order for it to succeed. I consider it the duty, the obligation, and the responsibility of Congress in a matter of as great importance as UMT to review the program from time to time. By July 1, 1954, the emergency may be over, but whether it is or not, Congress should review the program in the light of conditions as they exist at that time. I believe the Commission will do a better job if its members know that their actions are to be periodically reviewed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in

order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to object at this time owing to the fact that this legislation is before the House, but after this week I expect to object to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday until we get our veterans' legislation through the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATION FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to supplement what my colleagues from California and elsewhere have said this afternoon about the great danger which is involved in the drastic cut made by the House committee in the recommended appropriation for civil defense.

Some of us represent districts which have been described as high-priority targets in the event a bombing war should be waged against the United States, but I know that the whole American people would join with us in outraged protest against any form of misguided economy which might be construed by our potential enemies to mean that this Government regards certain areas of our country as expendable, if atomic war should come, and that Congress thinks it useless to spend sufficient money to give these areas an adequate system of defense.

I am sure that the House Appropriations Committee did not indulge in any such fallacious reasoning, and I am glad to read in the committee report on the deficiency bill that another estimate will be submitted to Congress in the near future to carry forward the civil-defense program. I earnestly hope that this promised estimate will assure a strong program of civil defense in every section of the country.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

PAUL DILLON

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I made certain factual statements about Mr. Paul Dillon, of St. Louis, to wit, that he was Mr. Truman's campaign manager at one time for the St.

Louis area and that he was a social guest at the White House.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the majority leader, then proceeded to castigate me, as he said, for attacking the President of the United States by innuendo.

I did not think I was using innuendo. I thought I was making it very clear that Mr. Truman was allied in a political way with Mr. Paul Dillon and that the acquaintance extended socially. These facts are pertinent to the political difficulties which have arisen in the State of Mississippi mentioned on the floor of the House. They are also pertinent to the success Mr. Dillon has attained in many of his other political endeavors.

I draw no conclusions. I merely say these are pertinent facts. If the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] believes that these facts reflect upon Mr. Truman, that is for him to say. Certainly the Members of Congress and the people are entitled to draw their own conclusions.

If there are other facts bearing on this matter, I would like hear them. The Members may find some elaboration on this in the reports of the hearings of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments held in 1947-48.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute further.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] owes me an apology for the completely unjustified and unprivileged remarks he made about me. I would be glad to receive such an apology.

I respect the office of the President of the United States as highly as does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] or anyone else.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. As far as an apology is concerned, the gentleman from Missouri is the one who owes the apology. If he did not have something in mind why did he make the statement he did? We look into a person's mind and ask what is the motive? What was his motive in making the statement he made yesterday? That is not something that is idly done. Neither are the remarks of the gentleman today idly made. As a matter of fact, in my remarks of yesterday I said that I consider anybody who makes a personal attack upon anyone, particularly the President of the United States, is engaging in something that is low, loathsome, mean, and contemptible, and I repeat that. That was a general broad statement.

If the gentleman thinks my remarks applied to him, I am not responsible for his guilty conscience. As a matter of fact, my recollection is that I exempted him so far as his motives were concerned, but, apparently, the gentleman's guilty conscience is speaking and when a guilty conscience speaks it produces strange and irresistible results. So the apology should come from the gentleman from Missouri to the House and to the President. I owe no one an apology. I simply was trying to read his mind and to find out whether or not he had pure or impure motives. I think the gentleman has given the answer.

AIRPLANE ACCIDENT IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday about noon there was a terrific accident in my district when a C-47 loaded with National Guard men flying from Kentucky to Charleston, W. Va., had the misfortune of hitting one of the high peaks of West Virginia, causing the loss of 19 lives and two injured.

I want to express the sympathy of the House and myself to the bereaved parents. Many of these boys were close friends of mine, they were constituents and many had voted for me in the past. I certainly feel aggrieved for the parents of these boys, the fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters and sweethearts, at the loss of these 19 fine young men.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SHEEHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the American Legion is relieved that some sort of action is to be taken in this Congress on what they have always called universal military training. I understand now, according to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] this organization will be known as the National Security Training Corps. Doubtless the change of name will not matter so long as a plan to give boys a chance for basic military training will prevail.

Ever since the beginning of its organization the American Legion has favored universal military training. I believe if we had adopted their views against subversive influences, nazism and communism, universal military training and some other things, we would not have had the wars of the past years.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is recognized for 3 minutes.

(Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and that they appear in the Appendix.)

POSTAL RATES

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, in endorsing the proposed increase in postal rates, I stated that at a meeting of newspaper publishers in southeast Missouri 2 years ago when this subject was up for discussion, I found not a single publisher who objected to having the postal rates on his publication doubled. Since that statement on the floor of the House and after its publication in the newspapers of my district, I have been informed by four of those publishers who were not present at the meeting referred to, that they do not concur in the opinion which I expressed.

However, from the tenor of their letters I am led to believe that their opposition to this proposal is influenced, at least in part, because of the extravagant practices which are typical of many of our Government bureaus and departments which not only take advantage of their free mailing privileges, but also show an utter disregard for economy by continually sending out hundreds of news releases and other propaganda which has no value whatsoever and which usually finds its way into the waste basket without even being opened. Not only is there a tremendous waste of paper and other materials involved in the printing or reproduction thereof, but an unwarranted use of large, heavy-weight kraft envelopes which are not only expensive but which in many instances are difficult of procurement by the average small-town printer.

I think the following letter from one of my publisher friends, Art Wallhausen, editor-owner of the Enterprise-Courier at Charleston, Mo., emphasizes the need for correction of a situation which has long existed and which is continually growing:

THE ENTERPRISE-COURIER,
Charleston, Mo., March 9, 1951.

HON. PAUL JONES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAUL: I see by the papers where the newspapers of your district are 100 percent in favor of doubling the postage rates.

Well, here is one you failed to interview, and you may read this into the Record from the floor.

This morning's mail, for instance, brought six No. 10 Government-franked envelopes and two first-class franked 9 by 12 Kraft envelopes crammed full of propaganda of one sort or another. My postage scale says somebody was knocked out of 32 cents worth of postage on that 1 day's mail alone.

If one considered only the Missouri newspapers, this would amount to more than \$3,200 per year.

Some of these items were also mailed out to 15,000 farmers in your district—the large packet full of mimeo forms relative to a district PMA meeting at Poplar Bluff.

Postage on that at regular rates would have been 9 cents times 15,000. You figure out where the deficit is coming from.

And, furthermore, Paul, you well know that nearly all of the newspapers are expected to print at least part of such crap, propaganda copy, each day or each week. That costs far more to produce than the difference in first-class and pound postal rates on newspapers.

Finally, take the Government out of competition with your country printers and that would help. Read that into the RECORD also—from the floor.

It is my considered opinion that the Post Office Department is one of the very few service institutions left in our governmental set-up. Each department now granted the right to frank pays for everything else. Why should such department then be allowed to operate for free when it comes to distribution and why should the newspapers and the long-suffering public be saddled with additional taxes in the form of boosted postal rates—to continue carrying the load for such departments. You might also ask that question from the floor. I feel certain that your fellow publishers will be more than mildly interested in the answers, if any.

Yours,

ART L. WALLHAUSEN.

Another similar letter from James M. Savell, editor and publisher of the East Prairie Eagle, East Prairie, Mo., sets forth the same criticism. His letter follows:

THE EAST PRAIRIE EAGLE,
East Prairie, Mo., March 10, 1951.

Hon. PAUL C. JONES,
Congressman, New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JONES: In your report from Washington this week we note with interest your statements regarding postal rates. One statement in particular, regarding a meeting with newspaper publishers 2 years ago, where you found not a single publisher who objected to having newspaper postal rates doubled, amazed me.

I did not happen to be at the meeting, but would like you to know my stand on the matter. If the Post Office Department will stop printing envelopes (at a loss to the Department), in competition to the printing trade, I would gladly pay double for mailing our papers.

I know of quite a few firms here who use post-office envelopes and if they were given to us at standard rates, would net us a handsome profit.

Next on my gripe list is the terrific amount of Government printed forms, letters, etc., which we find in our mail box daily. Nine-tenths of these are absolutely unnecessary and worthless, and of no interest to me or our readers. Some of these envelopes contain from 10 to 20 pages of closely printed lines, and it would be impossible to read all of them, even if I had the will to do so. All of these come first class and if all newspapers receive the same, must cost the Government millions of dollars.

Also, there seems to be no rhyme or reason in regard to the kind of envelopes used. One letter or so-called release, came last week. It was a single sheet, 8½ x 11, and was housed in a 28-pound-substance 9 x 12, kraft envelope. If any ordinary business was run like some of the departments of the Government, they would go broke in a month.

I am willing to bear extra burdens to preserve our country, but I think it is high time some of the waste was eliminated.

Personally, I like you, but I can't go along with some of your ideas.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. SAVELL,

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 349. An act to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Catholic.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by the national vice commander of the American Legion.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a very worth-while statement from Clarence Snyder, of Blanchester, Ohio, which has been given wide publicity.

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by Mr. Sloan, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$205.

Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the April 6 issue of Common Weal.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Hon. John Davis Lodge, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$184.50.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in one to include an editorial and in the other a letter.

Mr. BEAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Reporter-Dispatch of White Springs, N. Y., commenting favorably on H. R. 479 introduced by my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. CRUMPACKER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include previous remarks made on April 6.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an article from the New York American.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole on the third supplemental appropriation bill and include certain statistical material.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BELCHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing recently in the Washington Daily News.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a profile of Mr. Charles M. Hulten, general manager, International Information and Education Exchange Program.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 11, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

374. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navajo Indian Reservation"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

375. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 6 of Public Law 134, approved July 6, 1945, as amended, to grant annual and sick-leave privileges to certain indefinite substitute employees in the postal service"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

376. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report of proceedings pursuant to provisions of section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 959; 25 U. S. C. 70), with respect to the claim of *The Western (Old Settler) Cherokee Indians, ex rel. Dorothea Owen, et al., plaintiffs v. United States of America, defendant*, Docket No. 41; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

377. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report on proceedings with respect to the claim of *The Eastern (Emigrant) Cherokee Indians, ex rel. Jesse B. Milan, et al., plaintiffs v. The United States of America, defendant*, pursuant to provisions of section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 959; 25 U. S. C. 70); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2401. A bill to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 306). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Fourth Intermediate Report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, concerning a survey of procurement process (Rept. No. 307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 171. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to attorneys employed by the select committee of the House of Representatives authorized by House Resolution 93, Eighty-second Congress, first session; without amendment (Rept. No. 308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOODROW W. JONES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3291. A bill to amend subdivision a of section 34 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3292. A bill to amend subdivision a of section 55 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation

of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 3621. A bill to suspend certain import duties on lead; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 3622. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a \$1 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 3623. A bill to prevent smuggling of opium and other narcotic drugs into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3624. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of California with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 3625. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURTON:

H. R. 3626. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. R. 3627. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 3638. A bill to provide for an increase in monthly rates of compensation and pensions payable to veterans and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3629. A bill to authorize the attendance of the band of the United States Marine Corps at the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the Disabled American Veterans and its national convention; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3630. A bill to restore the right of vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States to pass through the Panama Canal without payment of toll; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3631. A bill to make the Federal Bureau of Investigation an independent agency of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3632. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Tishomingo, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3633. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Iuka, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3634. A bill to exclude from the United States mails matter advocating communism or the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3635. A bill to appropriate funds for the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 3636. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3637. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Baldwin, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3638. A bill to prohibit any carrier subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, in transporting property between two points, from making a difference in its

charges depending on the point of origin, direction, or destination; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STANLEY:

H. R. 3639. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3640. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 3641. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of works diverting water from Lake Mead and tributaries on the Virgin River, formerly a tributary of the Colorado River, together with certain appurtenant pumping plants and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3642. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of works diverting water from Lake Mead and tributaries, formed by Hoover Dam, together with certain appurtenant pumping plants and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3643. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of works diverting water from Lake Mead, formed by Hoover Dam, together with certain appurtenant pumping plants and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3644. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of works diverting water from Lake Mead above Hoover Dam, together with certain appurtenant pumping plants and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3645. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of works diverting water from the main stream of the Colorado River above Davis Dam, together with certain appurtenant pumping plants and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 3646. A bill to provide that certain vessels propelled by gas, fluid, naphtha, or electric motors shall be subject to certain laws relating to the inspection and personnel of steam vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3647. A bill to permit the allocation of funds under the Federal Highway Act for the construction, reconstruction, or maintenance of highway approaches to certain toll bridges which are part of the strategic network of highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3648. A bill to authorize the review of the findings of naval retiring boards and physical evaluation boards in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. J. Res. 226. Joint Resolution to relieve the Government of Italy of its obligations to the United States under the treaty of peace with Italy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STANLEY:

H. J. Res. 227. Joint resolution relating to clerk hire for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 228. Joint resolution to recognize Israel Independence Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Res. 186. Resolution requesting that the General of the Army Douglas A. MacArthur return to the United States to report on the progress of the Korean situation at a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 187. Resolution relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 188. Resolution to authorize the transfer of naval vessels; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 189. Resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain naval installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, requesting the Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to fiscal matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, being a concurrent resolution of the house and senate of said legislature, memorializing the United States Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to fiscal matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 3649. A bill for the relief of Mir Kazem Kashani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 3650. A bill for the relief of Khodrahm Sourshian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 3651. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adolphus M. Holman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 3652. A bill for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 3653. A bill for the relief of Angelina Marsiglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

201. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the Passaic Valley Methodist Parish advocating crime commissions and other efforts to uphold community morality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

202. Also letter from the Social Action Committee of the Packanack Community Church, Packanack Lake, N. J., commending the Senate Crime Investigation Committee on its splendid work and urging support of its recommendations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

203. By Mr. GREENWOOD: Resolution passed by the New York State Legislature, memorializing Congress and the CAA to reinstate its flight rules governing LaGuardia Field and Idlewild Airport; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

204. Also, resolution passed by the New York State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to retain local

offices of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

205. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of Indiana Division of the Travelers Protective Association of America, opposing any further increase in the Federal gasoline tax rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

206. By Mr. VORYS: Petition of Shamrock Club of Columbus, Ohio, and others, supporting resolutions for a United Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, March 26, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who committest to us the swift and solemn trust of life, so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. Grant us the grace to be valiant pilgrims on life's dusty and dreary way. Deliver us from unlovely self-conceit, so that we may not think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think. Make us forgiving and forbearing. Teach us to toil and ask not for reward save that of knowing we do the things that please Thee.

As we turn to our waiting tasks, may the love of friends, the confidence of those who believe in us, the spur of conscience and the commanding call of goodness be the guiding stars to lead us on. Strengthen our will to choose always that which is morally excellent, rather than that which is politically expedient. So that, having received the inheritance of heroic yesterdays, we may transmit it unsullied and unwasted to a brighter tomorrow. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 9, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2612. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District;

H. R. 3196. An act to amend section 153 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3297. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as

Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3587. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KILGORE, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office of the Committee on Appropriations was authorized to hold a hearing this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1951, RELATING TO RFC—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 9th instant,

Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, reported on April 10, 1951, the resolution (S. Res. 76) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951, relating to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and submitted a report (No. 213) thereon.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate has agreed immediately to proceed with the call of the calendar of unobjectioned bills, beginning at the beginning.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I believe more Members should be on the floor. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Morse
Anderson	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hendrickson	Neely
Bricker	Hennings	Nixon
Bridges	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Butler, Md.	Hill	O'Mahoney
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Pastore
Byrd	Humphrey	Robertson
Capehart	Ives	Saltonstall
Carlson	Jenner	Schoeppel
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dirksen	Knowland	Stennis
Douglas	Langer	Taft
Duff	Lehman	Thye
Dworschak	Lodge	Tobey
Eastland	McCarran	Underwood
Eaton	McCarthy	Watkins
Ellender	McFarland	Welker
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Frear	Maybank	Williams
Fulbright	Millikin	Young
George	Monroney	
Gillette		

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. McMAHON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOBY] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.